NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

VOLUME 1. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1841. NUMBER 39.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
AT 143 NASSAU STREET.

NATHANIEL P. ROGERS, Editor.

W. C. ROGERS, General Agent.

☞ To whom Agents, Traveling and Local, will address all letters relating to their agencies.

TERMS.—Two Dollars a year, in advance.

Three Dollars if delayed until the end of the year.

Ten Dollars, in advance, will pay for 7 copies one year sent to one address.

Twenty-Five Dollars in advance, will pay for twenty copies one year, sent to one address.

WILLIAM S. DORR, Printer.

PRO-SLAVERY RETREAT.

The Nation's Disgrace.

The following account of Gen. Harrison's visit to Richmond is copied from the N. Y. American:

Gen. Harrison at the Reading Room.—Gen. Harrison, says the Richmond Whig of Thursday, yesterday visited the Coffee House to exchange salutations with his fellow-citizens. He was greeted by a large crowd, but so great was the multitude that it soon became evident that all could not singly be introduced to and enjoy the pleasure of hearing him converse. It was therefore proposed that he should address the crowd in the street.

He spoke some twenty minutes, with a clear and distinct voice, and in an animated strain. He referred to the great cardinal principles of his political creed, and then noticed a few of the numerous charges which had been made against him. He had been called an abolitionist, he said. In one sense, as he had told his friends in Baltimore, he was an abolitionist. He was in favor then of emancipating the office-holders, and restoring them to the rights of citizenship. He would absolve them from the thraldom under which they have been groaning for years. He would have them to speak and to act up to the dictates of their conscience, as he would have all others. He would break the bandages which bound them, and set them free.—To this extent, and this extent only, was he an abolitionist.

Whilst uttering these sentiments his countenance wore a playful smile, but suddenly it assumed a sterner cast, as with increased energy of manner and voice, he inquired:—"But how could a Virginian, who sees in everything around him, the reminiscences of his youth, be an abolitionist?—How could a Virginian, born and bred on the lower James River, born in a house noted for some memorable incidents in our Revolutionary struggle, be an abolitionist? How could a Virginian, whose sires received many distinguished tokens of confidence and esteem at the hands of this virtuous old Commonwealth, be an abolitionist? How could a Virginian be so irreverent to the ashes of his honored ancestors, as to be an abolitionist? Could such a Virginian be called an abolitionist by another Virginian, and that other a true-hearted Virginian, and sound to the core? The thing was impossible. The bosom could not be free from taint that harbored such a suspicion.

He said he had not given pledges and promises before the election, because such a precedent was calculated to do mischief, and to confer the Presidency upon men of *promises* instead of men of *performances*. But now that he was no more a candidate for the suffrages of the people, and could not be affected by their votes, he had no hesitation in declaring, what had ever been his feelings, his steadfast devotion to the rights and interests of his native State. In this connection, he adverted to the heavy debt of gratitude which had been imposed upon him by the generous support which he had received from his adopted State, (Ohio) the young giant, Indiana, and noble Kentucky, which had honored him with her citizenship, although he had never lived within her borders. But all this did not efface from his mind what was due to his venerated mother.

He alluded to the report of Mr. Granger being an abolitionist. He said he had never been so foolish as to ask him whether he was an abolitionist or not—knowing, as he did, his public life and history. But Mr. Granger had come to him the day before he left Washington, and told him that an article in a Richmond paper, which admitted the possibility of his being an abolitionist, had just fallen under his eye. He (Mr. G.) desired him (Gen. H.) when he got to Richmond, to say to the editors of that paper, that he was not only no abolitionist, but he should expect Gen. H. to eject him from office should he ever become one.

When the General concluded, he was urged to "go on," but he begged to be excused, believing he could better promote the wishes of his friends by "going on," this day two weeks, with the principles he had avowed.

The address throughout commanded profound silence, and has elicited commendations, both for its substance and taste, from all who heard it.

Slavery—The Sphere of Woman.

The following passages are from a Discourse, preached on the last Thanksgiving day, by the Rev. Francis Parkman, D. D., (Unitarian) of Boston.

Glorious things have been spoken in this our day in the name of freedom. And to listen only to certain of its advocates, we should be ready to imagine, that but for them, it would depart from us forever. Much has been said and fervently, of the freedom of the mind, and of the duty of every man, woman, and child, forsaking all other guides, even the sure word of God, to think and speak and act for themselves. We are invited to examine with fearless hearts and unshackled spirits, aye, and probe to the bottom, the foundations of our social and religious institutions. Men and women of all classes and all opinions are assembled to consider on what grounds, if upon any grounds at all, we are hereafter to support, if they are to be supported at all, *the Church, the Christian Ministry, and the Sabbath*. And even in these days, when centuries upon centuries have borne witness to their efficacy; and myriads upon myriads of the human family have lived and died amidst their blessed influences, submitted to their laws, and welcomed to their hearts their precious consolations, and have gone to their graves, thanking God for the benefit, we are asked to deliberate whether there be not something wrong in their foundation, or unfriendly in their tendencies to the interests of man. And as if such discussions could not fail of weakening the authority, and with it the good influences of such institutions, there are those who can persuade themselves, that good may come from enquiries, thus strangely conducted.

We hear much of the glorious independence, we are bound to maintain, of thought and conduct. We are told how evil a thing it is and bitter to surrender our own judgments to others; and especially are we warned against certain classes of men, whose very profession, it is alleged, is fatal to true liberty of the mind, and the rights of mankind. We are warned against the Rich, because in employing they degrade and enslave the poor; and because wages imply servitude: against the Clergy, because they are tyrants, and the utter removal of this dangerous body is recommended as the first step to be taken towards elevating the laboring classes.

Connected with contempt of the Christian ministry as corrupt and ineffectual, and of the Church as only perpetuating evils, we hear much also in these stirring days of a time-serving clergy; of a clergy afraid to speak, being under bondage to their parishioners because they receive from them a salary; and to public opinion, because they want independence to oppose it.

I know not, my brethren, what these earnest reprovers would have us understand by an independent clergy or what they would have the clergy to do. I know, however, that independence is a quality better acted on than boasted of; and that my confidence in a true independence, whether in ministers or in people is better established by a calm, prudent, upright course of action, than by vehement professions of one's own independence, or by intemperate, and therefore fruitless, denunciations of even flagrant abuses.

That the clergy as a body, more than others, stand in awe of public opinion, and are afraid to utter their own, has never appeared. Ecclesiastical history does not show it. And for myself, regarding as I believe with no prejudicial eye the condition and the spirit of this religious community, I am under no fears, that we of the Ministry shall be tempted to renounce a just independence, or that the people would be so indifferent to our reputation, or so ignorant of our duties or their own true interests, as to desire it. Independence, rightly understood, is a quality held in high honor among us. I have good confidence in the spirit of the community in this regard. I believe, that all truth, belonging to the Pulpit, and that *ought* to be uttered, *may* be uttered; and it is my custom, as far as my province demands, to utter it. I believe, that all sin, yea, the most popular and prevailing sins, that ought to be exposed, may be exposed. The people expect that they should be exposed. They know full well, that even here are we called, and the minister, justly chargeable with faithlessness to his Master's trust in this respect, would incur the reproach and forfeit the confidence of his flock. I speak from my clear convictions; and could I believe, my christian brethren, that you set me here to please your tastes and to leave you quiet in your sins, to prophesy to you smooth things and to speak peace to your soul, when I believed there was no peace for them; I would not hold my ministry an hour. The community would despise the teacher that would, and his people would quickly learn to despise him too.

But then I must repeat, that this independence, of which so much is boasted, is of a wisdom that cometh from above; peaceable, gentle, having at once the spirit of power, and of love; learning of him, the great Teacher, who was meek and lowly, and while with burning words he scourged hypocrisy, bore patiently the contradiction of sinners against himself. And it learns, too, of his apostle, the intrepid Paul, who while he stood fearlessly before kings, and was nothing moved by bonds, and imprisonment, and death awaiting him, was still gentle among his converts as a nurse cherishing her children, and said even to the abandoned sinner, whose end was destruction, 'I tell you *weeping*, that ye are enemies of the cross of Christ.'

There is another subject, to which in this connection I must advert, on which, while there is much vehement defence of rights and liberty, there seem in my humble estimation some tendencies to excess. It is in relation to the *duties*, consequently to the *rights of women*, that I now speak: and I would speak too with that solicitude, which all just reflection upon such a topic cannot fail to inspire.

If any are disposed to honor and exalt female influence, 'I more.' I am not behind the 'very chiefest' in the estimate of a power, which God has graciously ordained among the wisest and kindest appointments of his love for the human family. Of female influence, rightly understood and wisely exerted, we are in no danger of exceeding, when we say, that its price is above rubies; that of the things which we should most anxiously cherish, nothing earthly is to be compared with it. Within the domestic and the social circle, in the nursery and at the fireside, 'she is the mother of our peace and joy. Her voice is the harmony of the world. All things there do her homage—the least as feeling her care—the greatest as not exempted from her power:' and to adopt the no less familiar and beautiful language of still another, 'I believe, that if Christianity should be compelled to flee from the mansions of the great, the halls of legislators, or the throngs of busy men, we should find her last and purest retreat with woman at the fire-side; her last altar would be the female heart; her last audience would be the children gathered around the knees of a mother; her last sacrifice, the secret prayer ascending in silence from her lips, and heard, perhaps, only at the throne of God.'

And this, my friends, is the altar, at which women should minister. Here is the province which may it please God she may always fill. An influence holy and beautiful like this may she ever exert. Never may she exchange it for one less pure and heavenly. And if there be those, who would draw her thence; and if there be of her sex any who are willing to be drawn thence; to exchange their peaceful homes and the nursery—'that temple of God—which temple they are'—and all its ineffable influences for the public meeting,* and the noisy debate, and the frivolous, or it may be the angry discussion;—if they *will* quit the sweet society of home, the teachings of their children, and the fellowship of parents and friends, brothers and sisters, that they may make public speeches and sit in committee-rooms, and regulate abuses, and cast out devils, and do other wonderful works; and if all the while, others, their kindred and friends can approve—and look with complacency on a wife, on a daughter, a mother or a sister, mingling thus in the strife of masculine assemblings; neglecting sacred duties at home, in which is their glory, and should be their joy; legislating after one sort for the children of others; and after quite another sort neglecting their own;—if any, I say, can see all this and 'love to have it so,' I must only say, they have formed other notions of woman's influence and of woman's province, than with my best reflection I have been able to form; and which, since I hold it the duty of every rational being to keep sound his understanding—I pray God I never may.

---

* The writer will not of course be misunderstood as including in these remarks any of those excellent public charities, so entirely appropriate to their sex, which have been conducted, and some of them for a long series of years, with equal wisdom and success by ladies of this and other cities of our land. Nor can it be necessary to add, that no reference is intended to a recent enterprise, which it is now ascertained will owe its completion to their effectual help, and which a grateful community will regard as not less generously undertaken than triumphantly accomplished.

GREAT BRITAIN.

From the Durham Chronicle.

American Slavery.—Meeting at Darlington.

On Friday evening, January 29, the large assembly room in the Sun Inn, was, at an early hour, crowded to hear addresses from Messrs. Collins and Remond, delegates from the American Anti-Slavery Society, with respect to the progress of the cause in the U. States.

The chairman, Edward Oxley, Esq., [illegible] remarks, said it became his duty to introduce to that large and respectable assembly, the gentlemen from America, about to address them. They had credentials from the original American A. S. Society, which for the last eight years had, through the greatest opposition and persecution, boldly advocated the freedom of the slave; and also from many of the most prominent and influential American abolitionists, testifying as to their tried integrity, zeal and efficiency, in this great enterprise. He made these remarks that the audience might know that these gentlemen were entitled to their confidence.

Mr. Collins then came forward, and spoke at great length on the rise and progress of the emancipation cause in the United States, and of the various attempts which had been made by the pro-slavery party, to destroy or get possession of that cause. The free as well as the slave States, were completely under the influence and control of a slaveholding policy. Slavery would not yield her grasp without a mighty struggle. This would account for all the opposition, the mobs, &c. the cause had encountered. That great country might on this question be divided into two parties,—the friends and enemies of slavery; the former of which comprised nearly all the professed piety and influence, and the wealth of the republic. Several efforts had been made from time to time to form societies taking a middle ground, to avoid the odium consequent upon a bold uncompromising advocacy of the slave's rights. But these associations, one after another, had disappeared. They did not embrace sufficient of truth to retain their hold on the interest and affections of the people. They had done great injury to the abolition cause, by diverting the mind from the duty of immediate emancipation, to gradualism, colonization, and other extraneous topics. Mr. Collins spoke of an attempt, in 1837, on the part of some anti-slavery clergymen, who had been bold, zealous, and able advocates for the freedom of the negro, but who were unable longer to endure the odium following their fidelity, to compromise the anti-slavery cause with its enemies. This threw the abolition ranks into great confusion and disorder for a long time. The friends of the slave were, to appearance, divided. This movement, ostensibly for the good of the cause, was signally put down; and since that time great success had crowned their labors. The cause was now passing through another ordeal. An attempt like that of 1837, to compromise this question, was now being made. A party had seceded from the original anti-slavery society, because that party could not make it subservient to other objects than those specified in its constitution, viz. the abolition of slavery. A new society had been formed, which preferred the most cruel and calumnious charges against the old society. He read a great number of official documents issued by the leaders of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1837, and now the leaders of the division, shewing, from their own words, that they then condemned the very course they were now pursuing. He read a letter from the last report from the Rev. Charles Fitch, the prime leader of the division in 1837, and who at that time professed to be actuated by the highest considerations for the cause of emancipation. This letter contained a full and frank confession of his guilt, in disturbing the ranks, for no other purpose than a selfish desire to please men for the sake of their good opinions. Mr. Collins also proved, from documents issued by the leaders of the division, that the charges brought against the original American Anti-Slavery Society, of loading the cause with extraneous topics, had not the least foundation in truth; but that it originated with its enemies, as the best means adapted to destroy its influence. He said the society had had, for the last six years, the *Emancipator*, a weekly newspaper, which had been of incalculable service, and their only medium of communication to the abolitionists of the United States. To keep this paper in existence, the society had paid more than $20,000 over and above its receipts. Yet, when the committee of the old society, and now the committee of the Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, perceived that at the approaching anniversary, in May last, the abolitionists would place the seal of condemnation upon their course, by putting the affairs of the society into the hands of a new committee, they resolved to cripple, and, if possible, to destroy it. The committee, of whom Messrs. Birney, Leavitt, and Stanton, were leading members and salaried secretaries, with $14,000 worth of property in their possession, secretly transferred the paper into the hands of a small local society. When called to an account, they rendered as an excuse their inability to meet the expense of its publication for four weeks up to the time of the annual meeting in May, which would only require the very small sum of $300. This, however, was a very lame apology; for after the transfer, this same committee, of whom Messrs. Birney and Stanton were members, voted Mr. Stanton $500, and Mr. Birney $300, in addition to the $500 previously raised to defray their expenses to attend the General Convention in London. He said, it would hardly be credited, when he informed the audience that these gentlemen did not represent the society which thus dearly paid their expenses; they represented a hostile society, which did not even have an existence till they were more than half-way on their voyage to this country; while they misrepresented the society which sent them over. These were hard sayings, but they were true, and susceptible of the clearest demonstration. Mr. Collins regretted the necessity of entering upon the American divisions, as it was not the object of his mission; but from the false charges preferred against the society he had the honor to represent, he felt called upon, in justice to the cause of the slave, to meet and disprove the objections which had been propagated against it. The character of the society had been attacked, and he had either to plead guilty to the charges, or to prove them false. He hoped this explanation would be a sufficient apology for his presenting this subject before them.

Mr. Remond, a gentleman of color, next addressed the meeting for a considerable time, in a very interesting and energetic manner, on the subject of prejudice against colored people in America. It appeared from his remarks that there is not one place in all that great and otherwise interesting country, which is free from this most unnatural and inhuman feeling. It is carried to such an extent as even to follow them into the graveyard.

John Kipling, Esq. moved the following resolution, which was seconded by J. Church Backhouse, Esq. and carried unanimously:

"That this meeting desires to convey to Messrs. Collins and Remond its sincere thanks for the interesting addresses to which it has listened with such painful emotion; and also its earnest hope that the righteous cause they advocate will shortly become universally triumphant."

Joseph Pease, Sen. Esq. moved the following resolution, which was seconded by the Rev. Mr. Edwards:

"That this meeting, having listened attentively to the statements of Messrs. Collins and Remond, in reference to the unhappy division among the abolitionists in the United States, and to the official documentary evidence they have adduced with respect to the original constitution and to the proceedings of the American Anti-Slavery Society, we are free to declare that our doubts and objections regarding its influence upon the cause of emancipation have been removed; and we therefore recommend it as the tried, devoted, and uncompromising friend of the negro, and trust the abolitionists of this country, in this its hour of great need, will bestow that pecuniary assistance which it so richly deserves."

Mr. Remond said he wished to hear his testimony in favor of the resolution proposed by his esteemed friend, Mr. Pease, for the consideration of the meeting. They had heard to-night that there was a division in the abolition ranks in America, and from the important relations Great Britain sustained to his own country, he really hoped that the merits of the division would be fully canvassed. He regretted that the philanthropists of this country had committed themselves on this division, in favor of that body which least deserved their sympathy. He considered it most unjust to desert that society longest known and most faithfully tried in the fiery ordeal of suffering and proscription, and which had for the last eight years stood storm-proof against every species of opposition. He felt that the English friends had committed themselves to what was called new organization, prematurely, and that too, from ex parte statements. He felt free to declare, that up to that hour, the expression of the free people of color, so far as any had been made, was in favor of the original American Anti-Slavery Society. He considered the decision of the colored people the best thermometer to enable the meeting to form a judgment as to the rise and fall of genuine abolition. For the undiminished regard they had for those bold, true, and fearless advocates of their cause, William Lloyd Garrison and Nathaniel P. Rogers, he would refer the audience to their reception in Boston, on their return from this country a short time since, by the colored people of that city. Mr. Remond sincerely desired that every friend who should vote in favor of the resolution, would do so from convictions of duty, after a full consideration of the question; and if there were any present who differed with him on the merits of the resolution, he hoped they would be free to express their objections, and to vote accordingly.

The resolution was carried unanimously, by a show of hands.

The chairman then addressed the meeting as follows:—I congratulate this large and highly respectable and influential meeting on the unanimity with which the resolutions already proposed have been passed—a unanimity that is fully merited by the gentlemen who have given us the pleasure of their company this evening, as well as by the society they represent. I hold it to be the indispensable duty of every philanthropist in this country to unite heart and hand with all societies in the United States of America, or elsewhere, whose object is the liberation of the slave from the grievous oppression of his task master; but it is due to the American Anti-Slavery Society, in particular, to wish them Godspeed. This society, based like the Bible Society of this country, on the Catholic principle of admitting all, of every sect or party, as members, who were true to the interests of the slave, and who were willing to lend their aid to overthrow the system of slavery has, in the face of the greatest persecution, and amidst the greatest dangers and obloquy, made its way, until the public opinion of that country has been so far revolutionized by its influence, that the ministers of the gospel, a majority of whom formerly defended slavery as a divine institution, sanctioned by the scriptures of truth, no longer attempt a defence of this accursed institution. I believe it to be quite impossible for persons of this country to form any adequate conception of the dangers and the sacrifices which those who early fought the battle of the oppressed slave in the United States had to pass through. They were assailed by mobs of *gentlemen*; they were pointed at by men of influence as pests in society; their houses and furniture were burned or pulled down over their heads by an infuriated people; they were tarred and feathered; their lives were threatened; and in some instances they have suffered death for this righteous cause. If a society that has endured so much for eight years, and that has already produced so wonderful a change in public opinion, and on whom the slave and the man of color cast their hopes as the instrument in the hands of providence for the working out of their deliverance;—if a society composed of such persons is not entitled to our confidence, I know not where we are to look for one. I earnestly desire that they may be encouraged to pursue their noble course, unheeded by the misrepresentations of interested parties, and undismayed by the mountain of opposition still before them. I trust they will continue a united band of tried warriors, who, having already stormed the citadel, will mount the breach, and never rest until they have subdued all their foes: and may it please the Almighty signally to bless their endeavors!

From the Liberator.

All Hail, Scotland!

We have received the Sixth Annual Report of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, which, with the Appendix, &c., makes a pamphlet of 56 octavo pages. The Society, some time ago, did us the honor to make us one of its honorary and corresponding members; and truly gratified are we to perceive that it remains true to the anti-slavery cause and to the broad platform of humanity, giving the right hand of fellowship to all who abhor slavery, without reference to sex, party, denomination, or caste. The world is deeply indebted to this Society for what it has done in behalf of universal emancipation, and the liberated bondmen of the British West Indies have special cause to be grateful to Heaven for its existence. We look over its list of officers with delight. The names of Grahame, Wardlaw, Heugh, Wigham, Murray, Smeal, Anderson, Beith, M'Tear, and many other faithful laborers in our sacred enterprise, fill us with joy and gratitude as they meet our sight. O, for another opportunity to see them face to face!

The appendix to the Report contains an interesting letter from the French Society for the abolition of slavery, of which Odillon Barrot is President, and Isambert Secretary:—Another from the British minister at Madrid to the Spanish minister, respecting the Amistad captives:—A valuable Report of the directors to a special general meeting of the Chamber of Commerce and Manufactures at Manchester, on the growth of Cotton in India:—The unmutilated speech of the venerable Clarkson, as originally prepared by him in writing, and intended to have been delivered at the opening of the London Anti-Slavery Convention, but a portion of which was suppressed at the pertinacious solicitation of members of the famous London Committee:—The names of the American delegates who were excluded from the London Convention by the resolution declaring females inadmissible, and also the names of those delegates who, in consequence of the aforesaid resolution, refused to take seats in the Convention:—The proceedings of various anti-slavery societies in this country, rebuking the Convention for its prospective conduct, and approving the course of the delegates who refused to join that body:—The Correspondence between Lucretia Mott and Daniel O'Connell, respecting the exclusion of the female delegates from the Convention:—And, finally, the last eloquent and impressive Report of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, from the pen of Mrs. Chapman, which is prefaced as follows:—'The following Report contains sentiments in themselves so excellent, and the spirit which it displays is so thoroughly that of *Universal* Freedom, that it is earnestly recommended to all to be *read with attention*.'

From the Glasgow Report, we select the following interesting extracts:

"While we rejoice that the spirit of abolitionism has gone forth successfully last year as formerly, and is working a glorious transformation on the minds of the American people, which must, with the aid of external circumstances, soon, we trust, work out the destruction of slavery in the United States; we cannot but lament the division in the ranks of the combatants—we cannot but regret that they have permitted their differences of opinion, on other subjects, to divide their efforts on this.

"Prejudice against color, sex, sect and party, have, whether avowed or not, exercised a pernicious influence in dis-uniting those who, while the tender feelings of humanity reigned predominant in their bosoms, should, as kindred drops, have been mingled into one.

"Whilst the foregoing distinctions should, upon Christian principles, have been regarded as matters of indifference, and as no proof whatever, either of the fitness or unfitness of any one to be enlisted in this warfare against cruelty and oppression, the most deadly and destructive to a large portion of the human race—the only test required should have been sufficient proof of a bosom glowing with humanity to man, the test of discipleship required by our common Saviour—'By *this* all shall men know that ye are *my* disciples, if ye have *love* one toward another.'

"Love to one another, love to our brother in bonds, and the faculty of giving utterance to that love so as to affect the hearts of others, should be *the only qualification* required for the advocacy of the cause of our down-trodden brothers and sisters. What man, if his house were on fire, would, before he would receive their proffered aid, first inquire of those bringing buckets of water to extinguish it—of what color, sex, sect or party, the auxiliaries were!

"Such, as above, are the principles of the 'AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY;' and upon which there is established a platform broad enough for all the advocates of the cause. We heartily desire that the 'American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,' which has separated from the *National* Society, may yet unite with it on this broad Christian principle;—but, if this cannot be brought about, that, although separated, they may both be blessed by God, cordially and harmoniously to work out the entire destruction of the monster, slavery, from their otherwise happy and interesting country.

"Several of the early measures of the Convention, or of its Managing Committee, gave considerable pain to the minds of some of your Representatives, as well as to the minds of many others, with whom they were called to associate. The suppression of a large and important portion of the introductory speech of the venerable President, THOMAS CLARKSON, Esq., and the exclusion of certain of the Delegates from America, may be mentioned as acts which, in the opinion of these gentlemen, were of an illiberal, unauthorised, and overbearing character."

NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD

The Captives of the Amistad.

The intense interest which we well know to be felt by our readers, and by the friends of humanity universally, in the fate of these interesting foreigners, whose case is now undergoing an examination before the highest legal tribunal of the country, has induced us to set aside other important matter, in order to make room for the following account of the pending trial.

Correspondence of the Journal of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, Feb 22, 1841.

This important trial was finally commenced on Saturday last, all the Judges being present. The sitting on Saturday was occupied by the Attorney General, H. D. Gilpin, Esq., on behalf of the United States, until the hour of two, when the Court adjourned as a personal favor to Mr. Adams and by his request. The reason, although not formally assigned, for this request, was Mr Adams' desire to attend the funeral of his faithful coachman, who was killed by being thrown from his seat on Thursday.

Mr. Gilpin gave, from the printed copy of the record and the Congressional Document, No. 185, of last Session, a detailed narrative of the events connected with the case, in the order of time. He began with the coasting license of the Amistad, dated 18th May, 1838; the permit to Montez, 30th April, 1839, and to Ruiz, 14th June, 1839, to proceed in the schooner to Havana. Then, 22d June, the passport or license to three ladinos, belonging to Montez to proceed to Porto Principe in the schooner, and signed by Espelata, Governor General. Also, a similar license, 26th June, to forty-nine ladinos belonging to Jose Ruiz. The same day, an endorsement on the passport of Ruiz, that it had been presented at the proper office in Havana, June 27th, the certificate and register countersigned by Martinez, the commandant of the port. Same day, the clearance of the captain, crew, and fifty-four passengers, signed by Martinez. Also, a certificate that the captain, crew and fifty-four passengers passed the Moro Castle. The next incident is the revolt, with the killing of the captain and cook, July 1st.

26th August, the Amistad arrived at Culloden point, anchored on the high seas, within the admiralty jurisdiction of the United States Courts, and was taken possession of by Lieut. Gedney, of the U. S. brig Washington, on the 29th, she was delivered to the United States Marshal at New-London, and a warrant was issued against the Africans under which they [illegible] high seas. The same day, Lieut. Gedney filed his libel for salvage.

Sept. 17th, the U. S. Circuit Court sat at Hartford, and on the 18th the Habeas Corpus was brought by the Africans. The District Court also sat on that day, when Ruiz and Montez filed their claim to the Africans as slaves, legally purchased and held as such in Cuba, and their property, which was bound to be restored to them by treaty. Under these libels or claims, the Marshal took them into custody by warrant of the court, they being already in custody under the libel of Gedney. In his return, he calls "*the said* slaves named in the libel." On the 19th, the U. S. District Attorney filed a libel on behalf of the government, averring that the minister of Her Catholic Majesty had claimed them as the property of Spanish subjects, taken possession of by officers of the United States, under such circumstances as made it the duty of the U. S. to return them; and praying the court to make such decree as will enable the government to comply with the treaty, and preserve the public faith inviolate; or, if they should be found to have been brought into the country in violation of the laws against the slave trade, they should be placed in the hands of the President, to be disposed of according to the Act of Congress of 1819. Under this libel the Marshal again took possession of the negroes.

Sept. 20th, the indictments were laid before the Grand Jury, but were not found by the jury.

Sept. 23d. The Habeas Corpus was dismissed by the Circuit Court, both courts adjourned and all criminal proceedings were at an end, and the case remained only under the several libels.

Nov. 19th. The District Court met again, the U. S. Attorney filed a second libel, and the Spanish Vice-Consul put in a claim to the boy, Antonio, on behalf of the heirs of Capt. Ferrer. The negroes filed their several pleas to the jurisdiction of the court, setting forth that they were free, were kidnapped, carried to Cuba, unlawfully sold there, never subject to the laws of Spain, but put by line on board the Amistad to be carried they knew not where, as slaves, and in the exercise of that love of liberty natural to all men, they rose, killed the captain, took possession of the vessel, and determined to return to their own country, as they had a right to do.

Jan. 7, 1840, the trial before the District Court, in the course of which the District Attorney entered on the record his admission that the Africans were Bozals. Judge Judson denied that the schooner and cargo were Spanish, and that Gedney and his associates should receive salvage; also, that the negroes were not the property of Ruiz and Montez, but were free, and having been imported unlawfully from Africa, should be placed in the hands of the President to be sent back, under the Act of Congress. From this decree, the United States appealed.

After giving this summary, which took about three hours, Mr. Baldwin read his motion to dismiss the appeal, on the ground, 1. That the United States have no right, by their constitution or laws, or the laws of nations, to take an appeal, or to take any proceedings to prevent the surrendering of the respondents as slaves, 2. That there was no demand made by the Spanish minister for them as slaves, and no appearance authorized by him, or on his behalf, against them as slaves, that the U. S. Government had no right to surrender them for trial, and that, in any view, the appeal could not be tried here, because the several appellees were not, individually, of the value of $2000.

On Monday, the Attorney Gen'l briefly recapitulated the evidence and the substance of the decree of the court below, which had been affirmed *pro forma* in the Circuit Court, and then stated the points which he considered to be established. They were, that the vessel and cargo at Havana were the ascertained property of Spanish subjects; that slavery is allowed there, and slaves are property; that these particular negroes were there certified by the Gov. General, the highest official authority on the island, to be *ladinos*, and the property of Ruiz and Montez, who had a regular permit to ship them on board the Amistad. This vessel, thus certified, and these negroes in charge of the persons certified to be their owners, were regularly cleared, with the proper papers. Here then was the complete documentary evidence of property, ascertained by the highest official evidence. On the 26th of August, the vessel not having changed in any respect her national character, her papers all on board, and the certified owners of these negroes on board, and in possession of the property which they were thus officially shown to be entitled to hold by the laws of Cuba, were taken possession of by a public armed vessel of the United States, and delivered to the proper tribunals.—At this point, the minister of Spain interferes, and demands that, according to the provisions of the treaty, the vessel, cargoes and negroes shall be delivered to his charge for the owners.

The only inquiries, then, are, 1. Whether due and sufficient proof has been made of the property in the vessel, cargo and negroes. And

2. Have the United States a right to interfere, as they have done in this case, to obtain the restoration of this property to its owners.

He argued that due and sufficient proof of property has been made to authorize the restoration of this property. Property in slaves is held as completely in Cuba, as in any one of the United States, and if they are property of Spanish subjects, they must be given up under treaty of 1795, the same as any other property, on proof of ownership. The certificate of the Governor General, that they are slaves, and are the property of the persons named as owners, is conclusive on this point. He is the highest functionary known to the laws of that land, and as such, his public acts are to be received as evidence of any facts certified by him, within the scope of his authority. Commerce would be at an end, if countries were to refuse full faith to the official documents of the proper authorities of other countries. The question whether these authorities have acted right or wrong cannot be raised here; if it is ascertained by the proper certificate that they have acted within the scope of their authority, whether they be judicial, executive, or any other public functionary, makes no difference. How could the tribunals of our country inquire into the local laws and municipal regulations of another! This doctrine is sustained by the whole course of judicial decisions, both in this Court and elsewhere. This court has sustained the decrees of foreign Courts on matters before them, whether this Court deemed the decree right or wrong. The principles so well established on this point can apply to no case, more fully than to the present. Here is exactly the evidence that ought to be had, the papers are such as the parties were bound to [illegible] and they are therefore conclusive. The evidence [illegible] by the District Court to be sufficient to establish the right of property in the vessel and the goods; why is it not then in regard to the negroes? It was sufficient in the Island of Cuba, and therefore ought to be received as sufficient here. It is a settled principle of Admiralty proceedings, that the best evidence to be had is the documents accompanying the property, and the Courts will always look to that as conclusive, where they are regular.

The learned Attorney argued further, that there is no different rule of evidence in the case of slave property and any other, that it must have been the understanding of both nations, by the 9th Article of the Treaty, that slaves were to be restored as any other property; that this Court cannot look behind the certificate of the Governor General to ascertain whether the negroes are recently imported from Africa, that if they are so imported they yet are not free by Spanish laws until judicially "declared free" by the proper Spanish tribunal, that the allegation of fraud in obtaining the certificate cannot be made here. But if you go behind the certificate, there is no evidence but hearsay. Dr. Madden's deposition is chiefly hearsay and has been contradicted in several important particulars. Is it upon such grounds that the Court will set aside the official records of foreign countries?

On the point whether the Executive had a right to interfere, at the request of the public functionary of Spain, the Attorney General urged, first, that the Executive was bound to interfere, because it was in the execution of a treaty stipulation, and the Executive was the proper organ of the government to see to the execution of treaty stipulations. If called upon to restore property, the President was bound to take measures for that purpose. And if he found it in custody of the Courts, he was bound to go to the Court, and present the evidence, and require the decision of the Court. As to the decree of the Court below, it was clearly wrong in awarding salvage on the vessel and cargo, because the treaty is express that property shall be restored entire and without diminution, and therefore no citizen of the United States had any right of salvage under such circumstances. The treaty was as effective as any Act of Congress, because all treaties are declared by the Constitution to be the supreme law of the land. And in regard to the negroes, the decree is erroneous, because they are fully shown to be property of Spanish subjects, and ought to have been restored as such, on due proof.

Mr. Gilpin closed at twenty minutes past one, and the remainder of the sitting was occupied by Mr. Baldwin, on behalf of the Africans, in urging the motion to dismiss the appeal.

—

WASHINGTON, Feb. 23, 1841.

Mr Baldwin, in opening his argument, said that in appearing on behalf of these humble Africans, whom he represented, and who are contending for freedom and life, with two powerful governments arrayed against them, it was a source of high gratification that the question will be heard and tried by a tribunal which is elevated high above the influence of Executive power or popular prejudice. By its very constitution, it is exempt from all the imputations, to which, under other circumstances, Courts are subject—imputations such as he regretted to say, have been most unjustly cast, in certain quarters, on the Hon. Judge of the District Court in Connecticut, before whom this cause was first tried. In a case of this kind, involving the destiny of thirty-six unhappy men, cast by Providence on our shores, under circumstances calculated [illegible] truly known, he [illegible] sorry that attempts [illegible] on the very eve of the trial before the Court of dernier resort, to disturb the course of justice, by appeals to local prejudices and sectional interests, and especially that even the official gazette of the government had stooped to publish imputations upon judicial functionaries, and appeals to prejudice, represented as coming from one of the most commanding minds of the country, calculated to impair the confidence of our own and other nations in the purity and impartiality of this high tribunal. And, what seemed still more grievous, that the accredited minister of a foreign government should, on the very day in which it was expected that this case would come to a hearing before the Judiciary, communicate to the Executive Department of our government, an article from a Spanish newspaper, to have it published to the world, charging upon these unfortunate men the most atrocious crimes, with the intent to have them regarded as monsters in human shape. I do not mention these things, said Mr. B., because I fear their effect upon this Court, but because it is my duty thus publicly to reprobate a course of proceeding calculated to impair that just confidence which the country has ever been accustomed to repose in the decisions of this Court.

This case, said he, is one of deep interest, from its circumstances, and is felt as such throughout our whole country, and almost through the civilized world, so extensively have the circumstances become known. But it has an interest on other grounds to our own citizens. It has perverted the question of power on the part of the Executive, in a manner that has filled men in one portion of the country with alarm and anxiety. It is the first time, since the government was formed, founded as it is on the principles of the revolution, that all men are created equal, and have from their Creator certain inalienable rights, formed expressly to establish justice, it is the first time that the Executive has appeared in court, litigating and appealing from court to court, to consign human beings to slavery.—Can the government thus appear before the courts for such an object! I deny it, and trust the courts will not sanction the interference.

In discussing the case, he said he would not appeal to any local prejudice or sectional feeling, nor present a single consideration which he could not hope would obtain the concurrence of every intelligent and [illegible] mind, from every quarter. He was not one of those who thought it right to agitate one section of the country with questions which properly belong to another. He had not come here to address the court on topics calculated to excite the prejudice or wound the feelings of any. At the same time, he was in favor of the broadest liberty of inquiry and discussion, although that liberty ought always to be guided by discretion and tempered with kindness.

Before proceeding to argue the motion to dismiss the appeal of the United States, he would advert to the facts, as they appear on the record. It appears that the schr. Amistad arrived in the waters of the United States, in Long Island Sound, in the possession of the appellees, who are all admitted on the record to be native Africans, recently from Africa. The papers of the vessel show that when she left Havana, there were on board of her, fifty-four *passengers*, of whom the appellees were a part, who were taken on board as slaves, as slaves under the color of two custom house permits, describing them by Spanish names, and as the property of Ruiz and Montez. They were libelled as property by Lt. Gedney, and claimed as property by Ruiz and Montez, and all the parties in interest were thus regularly before the court, by admiralty proceeding, in a condition to litigate their respective claims. In this stage of the case, the United States come in and allege that the Spanish Minister had made a demand, &c. "which claim was now pending upon the United States," and praying the court, if the slaves were found to be the property of Spanish subjects, to do what was necessary to keep the public faith inviolate, or if they should be found to have been brought in by an infraction of our laws against the slave trade, then that they should be delivered to the President to be sent back. The court after a patient investigation, found the facts to be, in all material points, as had been set forth in the plea of the Africans, and that they were entitled to be free; but as it appeared that Ruiz and Montez, in steering the vessel for the United States, had in view the preservation of their property in the slaves, it was adjudged that they were guilty of violating the Slave Trade Act, and so the Africans were placed at the disposal of the President.—The claim of Lieut. Gedney was dismissed, and that of Ruiz and Montez, with costs, and the first part of the claim of the United States. From this decree neither Gedney, nor Ruiz nor Montez, nor the Spanish Minister acting for them, has taken an appeal. Nobody has appealed but the United States.

The Spanish minister never was a party before the court. He had made a demand upon the Executive, not for the delivery of the Africans as property, but for their surrender as criminals. He had protested against the right of the courts to hold jurisdiction over the case, and so far from having requested the government to litigate the question of property, he confined his argument solely to the duty of the United States to transmit them to Cuba for punishment.—The first letter of M. Calderon, in which the demand was made, not only insists that the negroes should be sent to Cuba for punishment, but he goes into an argument to show how much less salutary will be the effect if they are executed here, of which he seemed to entertain no doubt unless they are sent to Cuba. Not a word in the letter intimates a demand for their surrender as property. He every where keeps up a distinction between the vessel and *cargo*, and the negroes. Throughout the correspondence, as communicated by the President, both M. Calderon and M. Argaiz protest against the jurisdiction of our courts, and yet the learned Attorney General argues here as if it was the Spanish minister through the District Attorney, who was prosecuting these suits.

Now, said Mr. B., what has become of Ruiz and Montez? They submitted to the jurisdiction of the District Court.—No principle is better settled in admiralty practice, than that a party in court is bound by the decree, unless he appeals. The question whether these Africans are the property of Ruiz and Montez, lies at the foundation of all the proceedings, at the foundation of the claim of the United States; the District Court have decided that the property is not in Ruiz and Montez, and they have acquiesced, by not taking an appeal.

What right had the Executive to interfere? The whole case was fully in the hands of the judiciary, it was the duty of the court to decide, and to see that justice was done, the parties in interest were all there; where, then, is the law which authorizes the Executive to interfere, to appear before our judicial tribunals, and make itself a party in questions involving individual rights? Is not the judiciary sovereign in its sphere, and is it not the appropriate department, so recognized and established by the very treaty of 1795, to investigate and determine the question of property and ownership? Was it ever heard of before, that the Executive should interfere to stimulate the courts to their duty? What does this appeal of the United States put in issue? This court has decided that as an appeal they will take no notice of any point in the case, not put in issue by the party taking the appeal. The libel of the United States alleges nothing only the fact that the Spanish minister has demanded that the negroes be given up as the property of Spanish subjects, but the libel does not allege that the Africans are slaves or are such property. In the case of the Exchange, in Dallas' Reports, the United States Attorney filed a suggestion that the vessel seized was a public armed vessel of a power with which we were at peace, and the court thereupon determined that it had no jurisdiction over such a case. But this is a case of private litigation, and as to all the parties in interest, it is definitely settled by the degree of the court below. The question of freedom or slavery is so settled, as between the Africans and Ruiz and Montez, the only persons who it was ever pretended had a right of property in them.

Look at the consequences of this interference. Ruiz and Montez are mulcted in costs, in the court below; now, can they be allowed to withdraw, and the United States come in their place, and thus deprive other parties of their remedy in costs, and perhaps damages? For it is to be observed that the United States pay no cost, and are responsible in no damages. No department of the government needs to be more carefully guarded against Executive encroachment, than the Judiciary; for no department is less able to protect itself. But if it is to be thus subject to Executive interference, what becomes of the security which the framers of the Constitution aimed to effect by the distribution of the powers of government?

But suppose the Executive had a right to appear in a private litigation as to property, has it a right to interfere for the re-capture and surrender of fugitive slaves who have come without wrong into the territory of a free State?—Was this the object for which the free States joined in framing our Constitution of government? Did they ever consent to such an object? This whole matter was wisely left to the States, AND TO THEM ALONE. The government of the Union has no power to establish slavery in a State where it does not exist, nor to give extra-territorial force to the slave laws of a foreign nation within the bounds of a free State. I speak not now of cases where slaves in possession of their owners are driven into our ports by stress of weather and remain in the possession of their owners, that the government should interfere to set them at liberty, as was done at Bermuda. That is not this case.—These slaves did not come here in the possession of Ruiz and Montez, but in the full possession of their liberty, with Ruiz and Montez in subjection to them. And now the claim of the United States is, that the Executive is bound to enter upon the territory of the free State of New-York, by its naval officers, and seize these men, and carry them by force into another district, and re-enslave them, for the benefit of Spanish negro-dealers. The vessel had been taken by force out of the hands of Spanish subjects, was not sailing under Spanish colors, had lost its national character, and was in the full possession of the Africans. What right had Lieut. Gedney to seize it or them? That seizure was a wrong, not to Ruiz and Montez, not to Spain, [illegible] the Africans, who were in possession [illegible] amenable to our authorities no crime for which they were [illegible] of New-York, [illegible] State, can the U. S. interfere and change his relations and make him a slave? This is on the supposition that the Africans had been domiciled in a Spanish colony, and were actual slaves by the laws of Spain. But the record shows that they were recently from Africa, and therefore never were subject to those laws.—Yet we are asked, as an act of *comity*, to suppose that there might be some law by which they could be held as property in Cuba. Slavery, as recognized by admiralty courts, is purely local, in the territory where it is established, but there is no country now where recently imported Africans are recognized as slaves. If the U. S. could give extra-territorial force to Spanish laws, it would not be against these Africans.

To the argument that the treaty required the surrender of "merchandize," Mr. B. made a most conclusive and elaborate reply. The same clause is in our treaty with Tripoli. Would a citizen of Tripoli be allowed to hold his white slaves in our courts under that clause? It may be well doubted whether it was ever within the power of the treaty-making department of our government to establish such a right. The fraudulent nature of the transaction at the Havana Custom House, in first shipping the negroes as *ladinos* with Spanish names, to evade the local laws, and then clearing them as "passengers for the government," to elude the British cruisers, was strongly argued. But I cannot give even an outline of what is by general consent acknowledged to have been one of the most complete, finished, conclusive legal arguments ever made before that court. I felt that it was an honor to any country and her courts, an honor to the science of law and to the jurisprudence of christian nations, that a foundation was laid for such an argument.

Mr. Baldwin closed about twenty minutes after three o'clock, by paying a deserved tribute to the illustrious individual who was to present the remainder of the topics in the case;—who, after having filled the highest office in this or any nation, thought it yet a higher honor to appear in vindication of the rights of these unhappy foreigners, the honor of the country and the character of our free institutions.

So, to-morrow, we hear Mr. Adams. During the two days, Mr. Webster, the Secretary of State that is to be, and Mr. Crittenden, the Attorney General that is to be, were repeatedly in court. The court room has been well filled, and some of the time crowded.

—

WASHINGTON, Feb. 24, 1841.

Mr. Adams spoke to-day about three hours and a half, and paused for the court to adjourn. I have copious notes of the whole, covering 50 post pages, not written very compactly, it is true, but sufficient to enable me, I hope, to give hereafter a tolerable view of the whole argument. Of course you will not expect from me aught beyond a meagre skeleton of the performance, which I may say has surpassed the most raised expectations in regard to its interest and power, and the skill with which the argument has been carried forward to its object. His exordium was in something like the following words:

May it please your honors—

In rising to address this court, as one of its attorneys and counsellors, regularly admitted at a great distance of time, I feel that an apology might well be expected for my appearance where I shall perhaps be more likely to exhibit at once the infirmities of age and the inexperience of youth, than to render those services to the individuals whose lives and liberties are at the disposal of this court which I would most earnestly desire to render. But as I am unwilling to employ one moment of the time of the court in any thing that regards my own personal situation, I shall reserve what few observations I may think necessary to offer as an apology, till the close of my argument on the merits of the question.

I therefore proceed immediately to say, that in a consideration of this case, I derive, in the distress I feel both for myself and my clients, consolation from two sources; first, that the rights of my clients to their lives and liberties have already been defended by my learned friend and colleague in so able and complete a manner as leaves me scarcely any thing to say, and I feel that such full justice has been done to their interests, that any fault or imperfection of mine will be merely attributed to its true cause; and secondly, I derive consolation from the thought that this court is a court of JUSTICE. And in saying so trivial a thing, I should not, on any other occasion, perhaps, be warranted in asking the court to consider what justice is. Justice, as defined in the Institutes of Justinian, nearly 2000 years ago, and as it is felt and understood by all who understand human relations and human rights, is

"Constans et perpetua voluntas, jus SUUM cuique tribuere."

"A constant and perpetual will to render TO EVERY ONE that which is his own."

And in a court of justice, where there are two parties present, justice demands that the rights of each party should be allowed to *himself*, as well as that each party has a right, to be secured and protected by the court. This observation is important, because I appear here on behalf of thirty-six individuals, the life and the liberty of every one of whom depends on the decision of this court. The court, therefore, I trust, in deciding this case, will form no LUMPING judgment on these thirty-six individuals, but [illegible] the consideration that the life and the liberty [illegible] them must be determined by its decision [illegible] individually, under very different circumstances, and in very different characters. Some are in one [illegible] another. In some of the proceedings by which [illegible] have been brought into the custody, and under [illegible] this court, thirty-two or thirty-three of them [illegible] charged with the crime of murder. Three [illegible] children incapable, in the judgment [illegible] crime of murder or piracy, or per[illegible]. Yet, from the day when the [illegible] by one of our naval officers [illegible] those prisoners, now for the period [illegible] by authority [illegible] United States. I trust, therefore, [illegible] established, [illegible] numbers will pay due attention to the circumstances [illegible] concerned.

[illegible] derive consolation from the consideration [illegible] before a court of justice, I am obliged to take [illegible] as I shall show, another department [illegible] of the United States has taken, with [illegible] the ground of utter injustice, and these [illegible] I appear, stand before this court, [illegible] on its decision, under the array of the [illegible] of this nation against them, in ad[illegible] nation. And [illegible] arises a consi[illegible] of all others, in considering the [illegible] in which, in supporting the motion [illegible] I shall be obliged not only to investigate [illegible] the censure of this court, the form and [illegible] proceedings of the Executive in this case, [illegible] and the motive of the reasons assigned for [illegible] in this unusual manner in a suit between [illegible] individual rights. At an early period of [illegible] my fortune to witness one of the tragedies [illegible] dramatist of England, I may say the great [illegible] world, where I heard a character, heaping [illegible] upon Cardinal Wolsey, at the moment of his [illegible] loss of favor with his sovereign; and another [illegible] saying, "O, my Lord, press not a falling man too far." I was struck with the sentiment, and have ever looked upon it as a lesson of morals, which I hope to carry to my grave.

It is peculiarly painful to me, under present circumstances, to be under the necessity of arraigning before this court and before the civilized world, the course of the existing Administration in this case. But I must do it. That government is still in power, and this subjects to the control of the court, the lives and liberties of all my clients in its hands. And if I should pass over the course it has pursued, those who have not had an opportunity to examine the case, and perhaps the court itself, might decide that nothing improper had been done, and the parties I represent had not been wronged by the course pursued by the Executive. In making this charge, or arraignment, as defensive of the rights of my clients, I now proceed to an examination of the correspondence of the Secretary of State, with the ambassador of her Catholic Majesty, as officially communicated to Congress, and published among the national documents.

Mr. Adams then commenced a "searching operation," of unequalled skill and thoroughness, into the proceedings of the Executive, with the reasons assigned. In the letter of Mr. Forsyth, Dec. 18, 1839, in defending the course of the government against the reproaches heaped upon it by the Spanish Minister, he says that *all the proceedings* of the government, judicial and executive, have been grounded on the assumption that Ruiz and Montez were *alone* the parties aggrieved. I ask your honors, said Mr. Adams, is this justice? The Secretary proceeds to describe the sympathy which actuated Lieutenant Gedney, and his officers and men, towards the Spanish gentlemen suffering under the lawless violence of their oppressors, and he declares that this sympathetic feeling soon became in a manner national. Here was the motive of the United States for appearing as a party in this suit. And that motive is not justice, it is sympathy with one party, against the other. With too much reason does he call this sympathy national, and it is against this sympathy that I must call upon even this court to restrain itself—in the name of justice. One of the judges who presided in some of the preceding trials, is said to have called this an *anamalous* case. It is anomalous, case, said Mr. Adams, and I know of no law, but one which I am not at liberty to argue before this court, no law, statute or constitution, no code, no treaty, applicable to the proceedings of the Executive or the Judiciary, except that law—(pointing with tremendous emphasis to the copy of the Declaration of Independence, hanging against one of the pillars of the courtroom,) that law, two copies of which are ever before the eyes of your honors. I know of no other law that reaches the case of my clients, but that law of nature and of nature's God, on which our fathers placed our own national existence. The circumstances are so peculiar, that no code or treaty has provided for such a case. That law, in its application to the case of my clients, I trust will be the law on which the case will be decided by this court.

In commenting upon the first seizure of the vessel, he quoted the Senate Resolutions, (Calhoun's) of last session, and said, admitting these principles to be true, to what nation did the Amistad belong when taken possession of by the officers of the United States? The Africans were in the possession, and had the presumptive right of ownership, they were in peace with the United States, the courts have decided, and truly, that they were not pirates, they were on a voyage to their own native homes, their *dulces Argos*, they had acquired the right, and so far as their knowledge extended they had the power of prosecuting the voyage, the ship was theirs, and being in immediate communication with the shore, was I believe in the territory of the State of New York, or, if not, at least half the number were actually on the soil of New York, and entitled to all the provisions of the Law of Nations, and to the protection and aid and comfort which the laws of the State secure to every human being within her limits. In this situation Lt. Gedney, without any charge or authority from his government, without warrant of law, by force, by fire-arms seizes and disarms them, then being in the peace of that Commonwealth and of the United States, drives them on board the vessel, [illegible] and transfers it against the will of its possessors to another State. I ask in the name of justice, by what law was this done? Even admitting that it had been a case of actual piracy, which your courts have properly found it was not, there are questions arising here of the deepest interest to the liberties of the people of this union, and especially to the State of New York. Have the officers of the U. S. Navy a right to seize men by force, on the territory of New York, to fire at them, to overpower them, to disarm them, to put them on board of a vessel and carry them by force and against their will to another state, without warrant or form of law? I am not arraigning Lt. Gedney, but I ask this Court, in the name of justice, to settle it in their minds, by what law it was done, and how far the principle it embraces is to be carried.

In commenting upon the demands first made by the Spanish Minister, Don Calderon de la Barca, Mr. A. adverted to the illustrious standing of his name in the Spanish annals, and to his own friendly relations with him while a resident of this country, and begged to be understood as not intending to treat him personally with disrespect while he examined his demands, as they ought to appear in the eyes of an American Executive or an American Court. M. Calderon then demands, 1, that the vessel shall be delivered to her owner—who was killed; 2, that it shall be declared by the President that no court could try the negroes, but that he should keep them safely and send them to Cuba for punishment; 3, that they should be delivered up to their owners, or the latter indemnified. In what position does he place the President of the United States? First, he is to turn jailor and keep these men safely, and then to become a tip-staff and carry them to Cuba, to be tried by the slave holders of Barracoons. Was ever such a demand made upon a civilized government! If the President had arbitrary and unlimited power he could not satisfy all these demands. And if he could send 40 Africans beyond the seas by his own *lettres de cachet*, he could send forty American citizens as well by the same power.

In commenting upon Article 9, of the treaty of 1795, on which the United States Government has rested its claim for the restoration of these Africans as merchandise rescued out of the hands of robbers; he said he spoke of his own knowledge with regard to the objects of the Article, having himself negotiated the revisal and renewal of this very treaty, in 1819, and there was never such an idea passed between him and the Spanish minister of that day, as that this clause was to include persons as merchandise. The Courts below have decided that they have no right to consider these Africans as pirates and robbers. If the sympathies of the government and the nation had been impartial, in what light would Ruiz and Montez have appeared. These Africans had been torn from their country, shipped at Lomboko, against the laws of Spain, againt the laws of the United States, against the laws of Nations,—as far as the United States, and Spain and Great Britain were concerned,—they were in fact and in law, on the continuation of the original voyage, they were in a perishing condition, dropping dead from day to day, no less than sixteen having died of the treatment they received from Ruiz and Montez, before they reached our shores, while during the last fourteen months not one has died in an American prison. The moment they were restored to the absolute wants of human nature, furnished by the tenderness of our laws, the mortality ceased, and they have enjoyed perfect health. At the great day of accounts, said Mr. A., who is to be responsible for the souls of those sixteen men that died. Ruiz claims them as his merchandise. Who, in the closing hour of his life, would have those sixteen passing before his eyes and exclaiming, "Let me sit heavy on thy soul to-morrow." Who, then, were the oppressors and robbers from whom this vessel was rescued? Certainly not Montez and Ruiz.

The article cannot apply to human beings. It says the ships and merchandise shall be restored *entire*. Is that treaty made between cannibal nations, and does it intend to stipulate that when human merchandise is restored, the legs and arms shall not be cut off! This single word "entire" is sufficient to exclude human beings from the scope of the Article. But it says merchandise, rescued from robbers.—Who are the robbers, and what is the merchandise! According to the construction of the Spanish minister, the merchandise is the robbers and the robbers are the merchandise; the merchandise was rescued out of its own hand, and the robbers were rescued out of the hand of the merchandise. The Africans are themselves the robbers out of whose hands they themselves have been rescued. Is this the meaning of the treaty?

With regard to Article 10 of the treaty, he showed that if it applied to any party, it was to the Africans, who were in possession of the ship, and who were pursuing a *lawful* voyage, while that of Ruiz and Montez was clearly unlawful. The treaty says they shall be treated as our own citizens. Suppose the case had been an American vessel a Baltimore clipper, fitted out for the African slave trade, and had performed its voyage, directly or indirectly, and with fifty-four African victims on board, had been taken possession of by our cruisers, how would our own citizens have been treated? The captain would have been seized and *hung*. No appeal before this court could have saved him. Is that the provision of the 10th Article, which is sought to be applied in behalf of Ruiz and Montez? Perhaps it would be a nearer reward for their merits than the restoration of these poor negroes to their power would be, or any other act enabling them to complete their voyage.

But I must pause. You have a small specimen of the manner in which the whole three hours were occupied. More like it to-morrow.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 25th, 1841.

Gentlemen: The proceedings of the Court in this solemn case have been interrupted by the solemn voice of death. One of the learned and honorable Judges of the Court, who sat yesterday in his place, listening with profound and patient attention to the argument of a counsellor many years older than himself, reasoning eloquently in behalf of *justice* on earth, has been summoned to his own dread account, at the bar of eternal justice above. Judge Barbour, of Virginia, the seventh in rank on the bench, died last night in his bed—in his sleep it is probable, without a groan or a struggle. The servant at his lodgings went at the usual hour this morning to the rooms of the different Judges to call them to breakfast. As the Chief Justice was passing the door of Judge Barbour's room, the man said to him, "Chief Justice, will you please to come here, sir, I think Judge Barbour is dead." Judge Taney went to the bed, and there saw his associate, lying on his side, as if in gentle sleep, but dead and cold, with the exception of a slight remaining warmth at the chest. Not a muscle was distorted, nor were the bed-clothes in the slightest degree disturbed, so that it is probable his heart ceased to beat at an instant, while he was asleep!

At the usual hour for opening the court this morning, none of the Judges were seen in the court room, which was already filled with persons come to hear the continuation of Mr. Adams' speech. At length the Judges came in together, and their countenances looked pale, distressed, and sorrowful. As soon as they had taken their seats, the crier opened the court in the usual form, and the Chief Justice addressed the gentlemen of the bar—"Gentlemen, a painful event has occurred, Judge Barbour died suddenly last night, and the court is therefore adjourned until Monday." The crier then made proclamation to that effect, the Judges all rose, and retired again to their private apartment, and the assembly withdrew. I did not expect an announcement of so overwhelming a Providence in a manner so severely simple and subdued, but it struck me as eminently appropriate *for the Supreme Court of this nation*. It was in keeping with the strictest propriety and suitableness. It was sublime.

As there will be nothing more for some days, perhaps your readers will be pleased with a little further account of Mr. Adams' masterly analysis of the correspondence of the Spanish minister, which is the ground of the appearance of the United States as a party in the case.

After having shown the absurdity of the pretext that the treaty afforded any ground for the surrender of the Africans as merchandize, or as a part of the cargo of the vessel, Mr. Adams proceeded to examine the other arguments urged by M. Calderon de la Barca, upon the American Secretary of State, to induce him to send these unfortunate men to Cuba to meet the justice of the Barracoons, one was, that if these men were suffered to go unpunished after what they had done, it would greatly endanger the safety of the island of Cuba, where the citizens of the United States have so extensive a trade, and where numbers of them own properties, which they cultivate by the labor of slaves. I submit to your honors, said Mr. A., that the Spanish minister has no right to appeal to the courts of this country to pass a particular sentence between parties before them, on the consideration of their personal interest, or that of other American citizens, in slave property in Cuba. What will become of the liberties of this country, if our courts are to pass sentence affecting individual rights, upon a consideration of the effect their decision may have upon the interests of American citizens in all parts of the world where they are scattered, for if it applies in the case of American interests in Cuba, it is equally applicable in regard to interests in China, or Hindostan, or the Fejee Islands. It is no proper argument for the Spanish minister to address to the American Secretary of State. It was undoubtedly calculated and designed to appeal strongly to that *sympathy*, which the Secretary speaks of, and which he says had well nigh become national. It was well calculated to excite and influence the Secretary of State, not only in regard to supposed American interests in Cuba, but perhaps also in regard to interests that might be supposed to be nearer home. But was it JUSTICE? Was it a ground on which courts will decide causes? I trust not.

The Spanish minister proceeds to say, that the influence of capital punishment inflicted in this country, which he seems not to have entertained a doubt would be promptly dealt out to these Africans, would not be attended with the same salutary effects as if inflicted in Cuba. The indemnification, says he, which I officially ask in this case to the owners of the slaves, would be but a slender compensation, for although the property of individuals might be unimpaired, the satisfaction due to public justice is not accorded. And that, said Mr. A., is the reason why the President of the United States was to issue his *lettres de cachet*, and send these unfortunate individuals to Cuba. There are some other passages in this letter, said Mr. A., which I had rather your Honors would read when you are together in your apartment for consultation. I hope the court will read them, but I had rather not trust myself to comment upon them as they deserve. Your Honors, in the pursuit of JUSTICE, will read them, and will see why I abstain from doing it.

The Spanish Minister concludes with referring to the readiness with which the Spanish authorities would accord to citizens of the United States any fugitive slaves who might be found in the island of Cuba. And was this, said Mr. A., an argument to be addressed to the Secretary of State of the United States? Is it upon these principles that this case is to be decided? Is it by the offer of such an equivalent that our Government is to be persuaded to deliver over these unhappy men? "If you will deliver these negroes to me, for whose blood all the slave traders of Cuba thirst, and any slave from the Southern States shall take refuge in the island of Cuba will be readily given up." What is this argument, as addressed to the Secretary of State? It is, that it would be a very easy thing for the Governor General of Cuba to seize a fugitive slave or *pretended* slave from the South, and put him on board of a vessel, and send him to one of the Southern States. It may be so. It appears from one of the authorities read by the learned Attorney General, that this Governor has royal power, that he is in fact equal to the king, and it may be easy for him to do such a thing to any man, black or white, slave or free. But is that to be done by the President of the United States, or to be required of him? If it is, I should hope he would wait for some more explicit stipulations than appear in the treaty of 1795. It was quite enough, one would think, to require the President of the United States to keep these men safely, and to send them back speedily, without making this—what shall I call it?—this—offer to send back the slaves of the South if the President will deliver up these Africans to the authorities of Cuba.

Now, may it please your Honors, we are to inquire what was it the duty of the Secretary of State to do on receiving such a demand? What did he do? His first act was to misrepresent the demand, and write to the District Attorney of the United States for Connecticut, directing him to pursue a claim for these negroes to be delivered up as property, because the Spanish Minister had demanded them to be given up under the treaty. That is what he did, when it is apparent that the Spanish Minister had made no such demand, he had ordered the District Attorney *to take care that no decision of the District Court or of any other, should place them beyond the control of the Executive.* That is what he did. And the consequence is, the appearance of this case before the Court. The Attorney of the United States pursued his orders. He stated in his libel, that the Spanish Minister had demanded the restoration of the negroes as the property of Spanish subjects. And then, as if conscious that this process might not be sufficient to effect the other branch of his instructions, to wit, to prevent the negroes from being placed "beyond the control of the Executive," he added another claim, of his own accord, as far as appears, that if the Court should find them not to be slaves, they should be placed at the disposal of the President for a violation of the laws against the slave trade. That was the execution of his order to *take care* that no Court should place them beyond the control of the Executive. In a subsequent stage of the proceedings, the District Attorney filed another libel, in which he left out this alternative demand. Why was this? I can conceive of no reason but that he had been so instructed by the Secretary of State. These instructions do not appear in the printed Documents communicated by the President to Congress. But it does not follow that no such instructions were given. That Document is not a full communication of all the papers in the case as I know, of my own knowledge. The resolution calling for the papers contained the usual exception of papers that cannot be published consistently with the public interest, and under that exception, papers were kept back. The amount is, however, that the Executive did not choose to hold itself responsible for that alternative demand. This appears from the bringing of this appeal by the United States. What has the United States appealed from? The District Attorney knew that the libel, founded on the claim of the Spanish Minister, falsified as that claim was by the secretary, was not sufficient to keep these Africans from being placed beyond the control of the Executive, and he therefore inserted the other count.

Well, the District Court examined the case, and dissipated every pretension that those negroes could be held as merchandise. The only *ladino*, concerning whom there was any pretence that he was a slave, the Court decreed should be given up. We do not appeal from that decree, although I confess, had I been of counsel in that stage of the proceedings, I should have been much disposed to appeal, on the ground that there is no article in the treaty which by any possible construction can apply to persons as merchandize or that had any thing to do with the restoration of this boy, and the decree was not warranted by law or treaty. Indeed, the District Judge seems to have felt the same difficulty, for he inserted in his decree that the boy was desirous of returning, and as *volenti non fit injuria*, I reconcile my mind to that part of the decision, for I could certainly have no possible motive to interfere with the wishes of the boy to return. And now, so strange, so singular is every thing that happens in connection with this case. I understand that the boy has not returned, but remains now in the custody of the officers of the court! And I feel bound, as an individual, to protest against his being delivered up to the representatives of his late master on any grounds arising out of the treaty, which, I maintain, has no application whatever to the case.

And now, what answer ought the Secretary of State to have returned to these demands? It was his duty instantaneously to answer the Spanish Minister by telling him that every one of his demands was utterly inadmissible, and that the President of the United States had it not in his power to do any one of all the things he had required. He could not deliver the ship to her owner,—he was dead: there was no owner, and there was no duty of the United States to dispose of the vessel in that manner. As to the question of salvage, that depended on the court, before which the case was pending for trial according to law. The proclamation required of the President, or the declaration that no court of the United States had authority to try the case, was not only inadmissible, but an offensive demand. It was calling upon the President to usurp a control over the Judiciary which he could not exercise but by the overthrow of the whole Constitution, generally, and in every particular, all the rights of the nation and all the rights of the States. And as to the delivering up of the negroes, that was equally inadmissible, for the President has no such power to arrest or deliver up any person whatever. But this demand is insignificant in comparison with the other, that the President should himself send them beyond the sea for trial. He should have called upon the Spanish Ambassador to name an instance in the history of nations, where such a demand had been made by any government of another and independent nation. To make the President of the United States, not the head of a nation, but a constable, a catchpole—a character not possible to be named in gentlemanly language! Yet, that is what this demand makes of the President of the United States. And the Secretary should have set the Spanish Minister right with regard to the tribunal before which these questions were pending, by showing him that it was not a State court, but a court of the United States, sitting in the District of Connecticut. And now, from that day to this, the Secretary of State has never answered one of these demands, nor arrested one of these misapprehensions, nor asserted the rights and the honor of the nation against one of these most extraordinary, inadmissible, and insolent demands. He has degraded the country in the face of the whole civilized world, not only by allowing these demands to remain unanswered, but by proceeding, I am obliged to say, throughout the whole transaction, as if the Executive was earnestly desirous to comply with every one of the demands. In the very misrepresentations of those demands, in his instructions to the District Attorney, under which this case is brought here, why does he take such a course? The Spanish Minister pronounced the court before which the Secretary brought the question, an incompetent tribunal, and this position has been maintained by the legation of Spain down to this very month, that a letter of Chev. d'Argaiz officially protests against the jurisdiction of the courts, before which the Secretary professes to be prosecuting the claim of this very minister! Why does the Spanish Minister persist in such inadmissible pretensions? It is because they were not met, *in limine*, in a proper manner, because he was not told instantly, without the delay of an hour, that this government could never admit such claims, and would be offended if they were repeated, or any portion of them. Yet all these claims, monstrous, absurd, and inadmissible as they are, have been urged and repeated for eighteen months, upon our government, and an American Secretary of State *evades* answering any of them!—evades it to such an extent that the Spanish Minister *reproaches* him for not meeting his arguments!

COMMUNICATIONS.

The Le Roy Convention—Gerrit Smith.

No. II.

FARMINGTON, 2d mo. 10, 1841.

N. P. ROGERS:

DEAR FRIEND—Brother Smith says, "let them (that is, members of the two great parties) become ever so thoroughly abolitionized, they cannot, *in* those connexions, go against slavery; and the reason *why* they cannot is, that these parties are essentially, and by the very terms of their organization, pro-slavery." The reason adduced to prove what is erroneous in itself and contradicted by facts, is fallacious. It is not true, that the existing parties, "by the very terms of their organization, are pro-slavery." As well might it be said, that this government, "by the very terms of its organization, is pro-slavery," or that the Presbyterian church, "by the very terms of its organization, is pro-slavery."—Do not the whig and democratic parties profess to embody the great principles which lie at the foundation of every just government? That they have sadly departed from those principles, no one pretends to deny. That this nation has swerved from those principles, is equally true; but would any one say our government, "by the very terms of its organization, is pro-slavery"? It could be said with the same propriety that we can say the same of the existing parties; for the reason urged in proof of the assertion, that they are pro-slavery, would prove the same to be true of this government; so that the obligation to withdraw from this government is as imperative as the duty to come out from the pro-slavery parties. If, then, brother Smith's argument is sound, it proves that it is our duty to stand aloof from this government; a doctrine, by the way, which I do not embrace. Would brother Smith say the Methodist church, "by the very terms of its organization, is pro-slavery"? Its influence, in the aggregate, is in favor of slavery. It is pro-slavery, in the same sense that our nation is, not by the very terms of its organization, any more than the whig and democratic parties are; for were the principles of that church, as laid down by its founder carried out, her now blood-stained robes would be as pure as the motives which influenced John Wesley in braving the indignation of a corrupt church and a perverse world. Just so with the whig and democratic parties. Let them carry out their principles, and their ranks would be as free from slavery as we could desire. But facts prove the assertion, that "let them become ever so thoroughly abolitionized, they cannot *in* those connexions go against slavery," to be false. Has not Governor Seward gone against slavery? Will any one say the stand he has taken on the question at issue between this State and the State of Virginia is not a noble one! Has he not done all in relation to *that* matter that abolitionists could have desired? and is not this going against slavery? Look also at the course pursued by the Governor of Maine. Has Chauncy L. Knapp, of Vermont, yielded to the "behests of slavery?" If he has not—and all know that is the case, for he even refused to vote for Harrison and Tyler, and received his appointment as Secretary of State in view of that fact—where is the truth of the assertion, that no man belonging to either the whig or democratic parties is worthy of confidence? The assumption that those two parties, *as such*, are necessarily pro-slavery, is groundless. As well might it be said, the Presbyterian church, *as such*, is necessarily pro-slavery. If it is necessarily the business of the whig and democratic parties to sustain slavery, how is it that the States of Vermont and New-York have passed laws which virtually prohibit the slaveholder from removing a fugitive slave? How is it that Massachusetts and Vermont have passed resolutions in favor of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia? This does not look much like supporting slavery, and yet our third party brethren stoutly affirm that neither of the parties will ever do any thing for the abolition of slavery, and hence the necessity of a third party. Facts prove the premises to be false, and of course the deductions are false.

The prospects of our final success are every day brightening. When the Empire State takes the ground, that taking a slave for the purpose of liberating him is not a crime, we have good reason to take courage, for this is virtually saying, that the slaveholder has no right to his slaves. If he had a right to them, it would be a crime to deprive him of that right. And what, pray tell, has caused New-York to bid defiance to the arrogant South, and declare, in the face of the civilized world, that man has no right to hold property in man? What has caused the Legislature of Ohio to receive a petition, praying that all members who are slaveholders should be expelled, and on a motion to reject the petition, what induced 42 to vote against it and 19 in favor of it? I do not hesitate in saying, it is through the influence of abolitionists, independent, too, of the third party. How any one can advocate the policy of independent political organization, on the ground that men belonging to the other party will never act on the subject of abolition, is indeed an anomaly; but this is no more of an anomaly than that such men as Gerrit Smith, Wm. Goodell, and Beriah Green, should come to the conclusion, that a political party is the best instrument for advancing a moral enterprize; especially when they must admit the fact, that to secure legislative action on any subject which comes within the legitimate scope of legislation, it is only necessary to correct public sentiment. That important legislative action has already been secured on the subject of slavery, will not be denied. And how has it been brought about? "Not by machinery, political or ecclesiastical, but by establishing in the hearts of men a deep and wide spreading conviction of the brotherhood of the human race."* If we continue to employ the same measures, we may rest assured that success will crown our efforts—that legislative action will follow as surely as effects follow a cause, or like causes produce like effects. As moral reformers, our duty is plain. We have but to move the CONSCIENCE of the nation, and our legislative halls will speak in thunder tones. It is but the WILL of the people that gives efficacy to law in this government. No matter how just our laws may be. Unless they are sanctioned by the people, they are not worth a straw. On the other hand, if a law is manifestly unjust, and is so considered by the majority of the people, it is not regarded. An illustration of this principle is seen in the case of the "black law" of Ohio. It is a well known fact, that the people of that State are more friendly towards the fugitive slave than they were before a law was passed forbidding them to fulfil the great law of love.—What course would these brethren pursue, if they wanted to secure legislative action on the subject of Sabbath breaking? It would be thought the height of folly to organize a distinct political party for the purpose of securing the passage of a law against carrying the mail on the Sabbath, and yet it would be just as consistent as to form such a party to effect the abolition of slavery, Sabbath breaking being considered by perhaps most abolitionists an infraction of the moral law, and also as a proper subject of legislation, at least in the view of this government.

Is it true, as one of the organs of the third party [W. L. Chaplin] says, "Any hope of good to the slave from existing anti-slavery societies will prove delusive. They have had their time—fulfilled their mission—for the most part, have passed into the enemy's hands—are now in the slough of *gradualism*, and beyond the possibility of a rescue"?* It appears then, our third party brethren are losing their confidence in the "existing anti-slavery societies." They are too "*gradual*" for them, "and are beyond the possibility of a rescue," having "passed into the enemy's hands." Have they "had their time," and "fulfilled their mission"? So says one of the third party organs, and does brother Smith agree with it? Does he wish to see the "existing anti-slavery societies" swallowed up in the whirlpool of party politics? If not, how can he give his sanction to a philosophy which, if carried out, will produce this result?

P. D. HATHAWAY.

---

* "American Citizen."

Tales of Oppression.

No. XV.

BY ISAAC T. HOPPER.

In the early part of the year 1810, a colored woman, about twenty-two years old, by the name of Phebe, held as a slave by Benjamin Donahue, of Newcastle county, in the state of Delaware, being tired of her bondage, left her master's service and went to Philadelphia; and there, meeting with a friend who resided about six or seven miles from that city, she engaged with him as a domestic servant, and accordingly went home with him. After remaining in his service a few months, she ventured to inform him of her situation, and solicited him to endeavor to procure her freedom. With this request he readily complied. Although poorly clad she had taken up none of her wages. Finding her an industrious, capable woman, he offered to lend her the amount necessary to purchase her manumission, and called upon me to negotiate the business; when I addressed the following letter to B. Donahue, viz:

"PHILADELPHIA, 7th mo. 26th, 1810.

BENJAMIN DONAHUE:

Application has been made to me on behalf of a black girl, who, I am informed, is thy slave. The person who has interfered on her behalf is willing to pay sixty, or at most, seventy dollars for her manumission. If thou art willing to set her free on these terms, please execute a manumission and forward it to James Wheelan of this city, and the money will be paid.

I am, respectfully,
ISAAC T. HOPPER."

The first intelligence I received from him, after sending this letter, was the following note from the Mayor.

"MAYOR'S OFFICE, Sept. 22d, 1810.

MR. ISAAC T. HOPPER:

Sir—Benjamin Donahue having made application to me, and stated that he is the lawful owner of a negro girl named Phebe, his indented servant, (not a slave) and that she has absconded from his service; that from your letter directed to him, it appears that she is concealed in the city of Philadelphia; and by the same letter it appears that you are knowing, or have an agency in the said concealment; and it appearing to me, from a perusal of the act of Assembly, that any person concealing a runaway servant, is liable to forfeit twenty shillings for every twenty-four hours of such concealment, and that you have been induced to take an active part in favor of said girl under the impression that she is a slave; as a previous step, I have thought proper to address you a line on the subject, and to request that you will have the girl delivered to her proper master. A compliance with this will prevent the necessity of having recourse to measures prescribed by law.

Yours, respectfully,
J. BARKER, MAYOR."

This note was handed to me by Benjamin Donahue. After reading it, I returned, by the same individual, the following reply:

"9th mo. 22d, 1810.

RESPECTED FRIEND:

Benjamin Donahue has handed me a note, signed John Barker, Mayor. I presume thou put thy name to it, without reading it,* as it contains a statement not justified by my letter to him, upon which it appears to be predicated. He is, however, left at liberty to pursue such measures as he may deem advisable.

I am, respectfully,
ISAAC T. HOPPER.

To JOHN BARKER, *Mayor*."

A few days afterwards, as I was passing the Mayor's office, I stepped in, and found Benjamin Donahue in conversation with the Mayor. Soon after entering, the Mayor said, "Mr. Hopper, did you get a note from me?" I replied, "Didst thou get a reply to it?" He answered, "Yes." I then queried, "Why dost thou ask me if I received it?" Turning to Donahue, he observed, "Mr. Donahue, we had better drop this business, like a hot potatoe, for Mr. Hopper knows more of the law in such cases as this, than you and I put together." I remarked, that I thought the Mayor had better let him adopt such a course as he thought most to his advantage.

After considerable conversation, I discovered that there was no indenture, and that the woman was really claimed as a slave. The story of her being an indented servant, was a mere pretence, fabricated in the hope that it would induce me to disclose the place where she had taken refuge.

The next day, Benjamin Donahue called upon me and manumitted Phebe, for the consideration of sixty-five dollars, which I received from her friend and benefactor, and paid to him.

---

* The signature of the Mayor was in his handwriting, but the body of the note was written by his clerk.

PUBLIC MEETING OF THE COLORED CITIZENS OF TRENTON, N. J.

The colored citizens of Trenton convened, according to public notice, in the school-house, to express their indignation at the course of the Colored American against the citizens of Trenton, and to consider their duty to support a free press. Mr. Stephen Jones was called to the chair, and Geo. S. Harper was appointed Secretary.

After some statements, by Mr. Arnoll, concerning the libellous article published in the Colored American, from Mr. A. Washington, against the character of the colored citizens of Trenton, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, we, the colored citizens of Trenton, feel deeply injured by a reckless communication published in the Colored American against us; and whereas, our sentiments were expressed at a public meeting, and embodied in a reply to the article referred to, which were forwarded to the editor of the Colored American by a citizen delegated to New-York for the express purpose of obtaining a place in that paper to refute the charges published against us; and whereas, the editor has unjustly denied us the liberty to speak in our defence; therefore be it

Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, the Colored American is unworthy of the confidence or patronage of the colored people.

Resolved, That this meeting tender its thanks to the editor of the New Jersey State Gazette, for having published a contradiction of the statement of A. Washington, of Brooklyn, L. I., which appeared in the Colored American, against the colored public school of Trenton.

Resolved, That it is our duty to support the press; and therefore, as the Mirror of Liberty, edited by Mr. David Ruggles, is about to be published monthly, in the city of New-York, we will do all in our power to support that free and liberal newspaper.

Resolved, That a copy of the proceedings of this meeting be forwarded to the editor of the National Anti-Slavery Standard for publication, and that the editor of the Colored American is again requested to let us speak, by copying the above proceedings.

After several subscribers were obtained for the Mirror of Liberty, on motion, the meeting adjourned.

STEPHEN JONES, *President*.

GEO. S. HARPER, *Secretary*.
Monday, Feb. 4, 1841.

NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1841.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT
WITHOUT COMPROMISE

Gerrit Smith's Letter.

We now resume our remarks upon the letter of GERRIT SMITH to the editor of the Friend of Man, published in the Standard of last week.

Brother Smith expresses his belief, that "the heartless ridicule," with which non-resistants have been pursued, has had "no small share" in driving them into what he calls "their glaringly untenable positions respecting the policy of abolition nominations." On this point it does not become us to speak for others—least of all for the clear-sighted individuals (Garrison and Burleigh) to whom bro. Smith particularly alludes; but we may be permitted to remark, that our own opposition to that "policy," as an abolitionist, has not been in the least affected, much less produced, by the cause of which he speaks. We know, indeed, that non-resistants have been ridiculed in a most "heartless" manner, on the anti-slavery platform, by the advocates of the third party; but it is not a spirit either of retaliation or prejudice, that induces us to oppose the organization of such a party. Our principal objections to the scheme, and, indeed, *all* the objections which we feel at liberty, *as an abolitionist*, to urge against it, exist independently of our views as a non-resistant. If it were otherwise, we would never speak against that scheme in an anti-slavery meeting, nor write against it in anti-slavery journal. If our conscience would not permit us to participate in the measure, we would at least refrain from opposing it on the anti-slavery platform.

Let us examine the foundation of the third party, as laid by brother Smith himself, and see whether it is solid enough to bear the superstructure which he is endeavoring to rear upon it. After asking the question, "On what does that policy [the policy of independent nominations] rest?" he replies—

"On the duty, the necessity, of abolitionists to break off from their national parties—parties which are, and which, whilst American slavery exists, must be pro-slavery—for the South will enter into none but pro-slavery parties. Let but that duty, that necessity be conceded—and even a child can see that no farther concession is needed to justify abolitionists, provided voting be a right and a duty, in voting in concert. Even a child can see that the scattering system pre-supposes that the existing parties, one or both, are reclaimable; and that this system is indefensible, if it be admitted that these parties, being national, are, and from the nature of the case must be, pro-slavery, whilst American slavery exists."

Again—he says:

"How strange that Mr. Garrison does not see that, in their present party connections, they [anti-slavery voters] cannot go against slavery! Let them be ever so thoroughly abolitionized, they cannot, in those connections, go against slavery: and the reason *why* they cannot, is, that these parties are, essentially and by the very terms of their organization, pro-slavery."

With all proper deference to brother Smith, we must say, that we cannot yield our assent to his premise, and if we could, we should still have plenty of good reasons for rejecting his conclusion. Admit that it is both a duty to vote and to withdraw from the present parties; we cannot see how it necessarily, or even legitimately follows, that abolitionists should organize a new party. The propriety and expediency of such a measure, it seems to us, would still be fairly questionable, on several important grounds. But, waiving this point for the present, we repeat that we do not admit the correctness of brother Smith's position, that the present parties not only are, but, from the nature of the case, *must* be pro-slavery. That position strikes us as unsound, if not glaringly absurd. Why are those parties pro-slavery at the present time! Is it because there is any thing in "the terms of their organization" which requires them to stand forth as the advocates or apologists of slavery? Not at all. It is only because the North is *not yet sufficiently abolitionized* to demand of those parties, as an indispensable pre-requisite to her confidence and support, that they should refrain from upholding slavery, and exert all their constitutional power to effect its overthrow. There is not only nothing in the "terms of their organization" which requires them to be pro-slavery, but much, in the principles they profess, of an opposite character. There is, in fact, nothing wanting to make both of them anti-slavery to-morrow, but an adequate inducement. Hence, the practical question which abolitionists have to decide is this: whether the formation of a third party is adapted to create such an inducement, or whether it is an appropriate and legitimate instrumentality for converting the people to anti-slavery principles? Looking at the scheme in this light, we can hardly express our sense of its folly and absurdity in too strong terms. The more the question is agitated, the more closely and rigidly we pursue our investigations, the more thoroughly are we convinced of the pernicious tendency of the measure. It is not only powerless for good, but, so far as it has power at all, it is mischievous. The more we reflect upon the subject, the stronger does our conviction become, that the much ridiculed "scattering system" combines all the advantages of the third party, (if it may be said to have any advantages,) without any of its evils. We know it is said, that men will not vote unless they have a publicly nominated, party ticket; but this is tantamount to the admission, that the men who are relied upon to swell the ranks of the new party are not actuated by principle, but must be swathed together by party cords, and cemented by party spirit. Will a party thus united be able to withstand the temptations which will beset its path, when the political ocean is lashed into fury by the conflicting elements, and storms and tempests are howling around it? Nay—it will crumble to pieces by the natural operation of the very causes which may for a time give it the *appearance* of a homogeneous and well compacted body. On a question of gradual emancipation, or compensation, or some other of the thousand expedients by which the advocates of despotism always contrive to embarrass the onward march of free principles, it would be very likely to enter into a pernicious and sinful compromise, for the sake of some fancied good to follow such a betrayal of principle. These remarks, be it remembered, are predicated upon the admission, so often made by the advocates of the third party, that men cannot be induced to vote independently, and on principle alone, without a party nomination or "rallying point." What we mean to say is, that such men are unworthy to be called a "*liberty* party," and that to combine them together under the *name*, while they lack the *principle* of freedom, with the hope of thereby abolishing slavery, is as absurd and preposterous as it would be to attempt to hold a seventy-four, in the midst of a storm, by attaching her to the anchor with a rope of sand!

Brother Smith says, truly, "that the scattering system pre-supposes that the existing parties, one or both, are reclaimable." Will he deny that this supposition is well founded? Will he say that those parties *cannot* be reformed by the mighty power of truth? If so, let him not complain when the third party is spoken of as "a substitution of political action for moral suasion;" for he could hardly furnish better evidence of the justice of this imputation then he does by taking such ground. He should have a care, too, lest in his zeal to overthrow the scattering policy, he at the same time undermine his own darling scheme; for how, we ask, is that scheme to effect any thing, if the other parties are irreclaimable? To say that the parties, as such, cannot be reformed, is equivalent to affirming, that the majority of voters in the country can never be reclaimed from their present subserviency to the slave system, nor induced to support the cause of freedom at the polls. This doctrine would furnish a much better argument for the abandonment of *all* political action, than for a third party. On that principle, such a party is *functus officio*—a mere farce!—a "laughing-stock before all Israel and the sun." If it have any foundation at all, it must necessarily "presuppose," no less than the scattering system, "that the existing parties, one or both, are reclaimable." Will brother Smith say that the majority of the *members* of those parties can be reformed, while there is no hope of the parties themselves, as such? How can he take a position so glaringly absurd! In the name of reason, we ask, what is to hinder the reformation of the parties, the very first moment a majority of the members become thoroughly abolitionized? Nay, what can *prevent* such a result? It might as reasonably be pretended, that the transformation of a $100 counterfeit note, into a hundred genuine $1,00 bills would not alter its character!

Yes—the parties *can* be reformed, they *must* and *will* be regenerated by the power of truth; and the practical question is, whether this work can be soonest effected by organizing a *new* party, or by acting independently of *all* parties, without the friction of political machinery. On this point we need not repeat our opinion, so often expressed; but we may say that it is daily gaining strength, as well by reflection as by the developements of the third party tactics. We do not despair of seeing brother Smith united with us in mild but firm resistance of a scheme which we believe fraught with danger to our sacred enterprise. He will pardon us for admonishing him, not to suffer his pride of opinion to influence his judgment in a matter of so much importance. We may be mistaken, but it has always seemed to us that his advocacy of the third party was more a work of impulse, than of cool deliberation and dispassionate judgment. His "sober second thought," we trust, will set him right.

We are reluctantly compelled to defer our remarks on one or two other topics till next week.

Mission to England.

On the first page, the reader will find an account, from the Durham, (Eng.) Chronicle, of a meeting held at Darlington, the residence of those distinguished friends of the anti-slavery cause, the PEASES, to listen to addresses by Messrs. COLLINS and REMOND, the former of whom was despatched on a mission to Great Britain, some months since, by the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Of that mission, owing to the peculiar circumstances attending it, we have hitherto said nothing; deeming it best to wait until its objects and results could be definitely laid before the public. As we expected, the friends of new organization have left no expedient untried, no slander unuttered, which they supposed might facilitate their main design of destroying the confidence of the British Abolitionists in the American Anti-Slavery Society and its worthy representative; but we are happy to learn, from the proceedings of the meeting at Darlington, from Mr. Collins himself, and from other sources, that his labors in that country have been productive of great good. Nothing shows this more conclusively, in fact, than the bitter and malignant assaults upon his character, which have been made in a certain quarter, and by an individual whose statements are always received with many grains of allowance even by his own associates, and whose general recklessness of truth and want of integrity are so well known as to render him comparatively harmless. We allude, of course, to the individual who has had charge of the Massachusetts Abolitionist for some time past, and who has degraded that sheet even below its former character. The slanders of Rev. Nathaniel Colver might also be referred to as an evidence of that desperation which is produced by a consciousness of inability to check the progress of truth.

The last Emancipator contains a lame defence of the Executive Committee of the American and Foreign A. S. Society against the solemn charges which have been tabled against them both in England and in this country, which will receive such notice hereafter as it may be thought to deserve. It was an appropriate illustration of new organization principles and policy, that that defence was kept back until it was too late for a reply to be prepared and sent out to England in the same steamer. But justice, though slow, will yet overtake the plotters of mischief, and defeat their machinations.

Dr. Smith's Lecture.

The lecture of Dr. JAMES M'CUNE SMITH, in behalf the Colored Orphan Asylum, which he was prevented from delivering at Clinton Hall on account of his complexion, was delivered on Friday evening last, at the Stuyvesant Institute, to a large and attentive assembly. His subject was, the causes and the history of the remarkable revolutions which were consummated in the independence of Hayti, as a republic, in the hands of the enfranchised people of color. He vindicated the slaves from the cruel and unjust charges which have so often been brought against them by the advocates of despotism, and proved conclusively, that "the horrors of St. Domingo," the tales of which have frightened so many into the belief that liberty is dangerous to the peace of society, were wholly attributable to the folly and cruelty of the slaveholders.

We have heard it suggested, that Dr. Smith would probably be invited to repeat his lecture, and we earnestly hope that the suggestion may be carried into effect without delay.

The Amistad Case.

We have no information concerning this case beyond that furnished in the report of the trial down to the time when the proceedings were interrupted by the sudden death of the Judge Barbour, unless the following paragraph from the Journal of Commerce of Tuesday may be deemed an exception:

THE AMISTAD.—Gentlemen who have recently left Washington, and who are deeply interested in the liberation of the negroes of the Amistad, express themselves with the fullest confidence that the decision of the Supreme Court will set them at liberty.

BAPTIST ANTI-SLAVERY CORRESPONDENT.—The Executive Committee of the Baptist A. S. Convention have issued the first number of a periodical under this title, the main object of which is to embody the correspondence of the Convention with the Southern Baptists. Rev. C. P. Grosvenor is the editor. It is to be published once in two months, at 50 cents per volume, to contain about 200 pages. The first number contains a letter from Rev. Elon Galusha to the Rev. R. Fuller, whose furious epistle was published in the Standard some months ago.

FAIRS.—The Salem (Mass.) Female Anti-Slavery Society have advertised a Fair, to be held in that city on the 14th and 15th of April, the proceeds to be applied as follows:—to the Massachusetts A. S. Society—for the benefit of the colored children and youth of Salem—and to sustain the ordinary operations of the society.

The Lynn Women's Society propose to hold their Fair the first week in May.

RARE ENCOURAGEMENT.—We are amused, says the Liberator, to see from what sources our third party friends obtain consolation, in view of their insignificant array. They claim that, at the late Presidential election, several thousand men were found "who would not bow the knee to Baal," *i. e.* who went for the third party ticket. Query—were the anti-Baalites of old, politicians, and did they finally overcome all opposition at the ballot-box? If so, there is, perhaps, some chance of success for the third party.

☞ We have been told by the editor of Zion's Watchman, that in our notice of his objections to the appointment of Dr. Bangs as President of the Wesleyan University, we did not quite do him justice, inasmuch as our statement seemed to imply that he objected *only* on account of the Dr.'s want of the literary qualifications necessary for the station. He has assured us, personally, that he fully approves of all that we said in relation to the Dr.'s pro-slavery character, as constituting an insuperable objection to his appointment to that responsible post.

THE LEGISLATURE.—It will be observed with pleasure, that this body, which was so forgetful of its own honor, and so regardless of principle, as to order a special pen to be fitted up for the accommodation of colored spectators, afterwards receded from its anti-republican position, and wiped out the stain which it had inflicted upon the honor of the State.

The proceedings in relation to the employment of colored ministers as chaplains will be read with interest, particularly since it appears that the clerk has invited a colored man to officiate in that capacity! Truth is indeed advancing with irresistible speed.

THIRD PARTY CONVENTION IN MASSACHUSETTS.—A friend has sent us the Boston Post of Thursday and Friday, which contains a pretty full report of the doings of this Convention during the first two days of its sessions. The number of delegates present at the opening, was "about twenty-five or thirty." Prodigious! Further particulars next week.

DANIEL WEBSTER.—The reader will find in our report of Congressional proceedings, a highly interesting debate, which occurred in the Senate on the presentation of Mr Webster's resignation of his seat in that body. The servility of the great Expounder is as lamentable as it is mean and disgraceful.

GIDDINGS' SPEECH.—We have received a copy of the speech of Mr Giddings, of Ohio, on the Florida War, made in the U. S. House of Representatives, on the 9th ultimo. We intend to copy it, if we can possibly find room to do so.

NOTICES.

EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The eighth annual meeting of the American A. S. Society will be held in the city of New-York, beginning on Tuesday, the 11th of May, and continuing, by adjournment, until the business be concluded. Members of anti-slavery societies, and friends of the cause throughout the country, are invited to attend. The

ANNIVERSAY MEETING

Will be held, in the *Broadway Tabernacle*, on Tuesday afternoon, at 3 o'clock. Delegates are requested, immediately on their arrival in the city, to call at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 143 Nassau street, and to enroll their names. Cards of reference will be furnished, directing them where accommodations can be obtained, at a reasonable cost, during their stay in this city.

T. VAN RENSSELAER, } *Com. of*
JAMES S. GIBBONS, } *Arrangements.*

New-York, March 4, 1841.

ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION,

FOR CENTRAL NEW-YORK.

Friends of the slave,—To you it is known that there has existed for several months past, and does now exist, an alarming division among the professed lovers of God and freedom—that there is a spirit abroad, and there are instrumentalities at work, which forever forbid the indulgence of the hope of a speedy termination of these internal feuds, and a united rallying around freedom's standard, bearing the inscription, "All who love the slave are brethren."

We, therefore, Abolitionists of the town of Cazenovia, having consulted with many of the tried friends of equal rights, in this region, do hereby issue this "CALL," for an Anti-Slavery Convention for Central New-York, of all those persons who are opposed to having recourse to the secular arm to perfect a moral reform, or of awarding to the ballot box power, the supreme control of the glorious enterprise of Anti-Slavery, to be held in CAZENOVIA, on WEDNESDAY, the 17th day of March next, at 11 o'clock, A. M.

All persons, of every class, sect, character, rank or condition, are respectfully solicited to attend the meeting.

Speakers, from abroad, are secured. Lovers of freedom, in Central New-York, rally around the standard of pure, original Abolitionism.

PETER DE CLERCQ,
JONATHAN WOODWARD,
B. T. CLARKE,
LUTHER MYRICK,
HENRY ROBERTS,
JAMES BURR, Secretary.
Cazenovia, Feb. 18, 1841.

LEGISLATIVE.

CONGRESS.

MONDAY, Feb. 22.

In the Senate, Mr. Prentiss presented the remonstrance of citizens of Erie, N. Y., against the ratification of the late treaty with the Seneca Indians.

Mr. Young presented the memorial of citizens of Randolph county, Illinois, asking the opinion of Congress as to the true meaning and construction of the Federal Constitution *in relation to the right of property in slaves*, the right of the states to issue bills of credit, and the power of Congress to establish a National Bank.

Mr Y. said the petitioners were Scotch Covenanters, and highly respectable persons.

Mr. Crittenden asked leave to bring in a bill to prevent the interference of certain federal officers in elections.

Mr. C. spoke at length, showing the object of the bill in question. When the debate was further continued between Messrs. Norvell, Crittenden, Wright, Clay, Calhoun, Buchanan, Cuthbert, Preston, and others.

The debate became very animated, so much so that, when Mr. Preston closed, there was a strong burst of applause from the galleries, and some indications in the lobby. Immediately there were cries of "clear the galleries—clear the galleries."

Mr Clay, of Alabama, with much earnestness: clear the galleries.

Mr Anderson, striking his hand on the desk: I insist that the galleries be cleared.

Mr. Benton: Clear the galleries—clear the blackguards.

Mr. Calhoun rose also, and called for the galleries to be cleared.

Mr. Clay: Spare the ladies—they have not sinned. I hope they may be suffered to remain.

The east gallery was soon cleared, though crowded to suffocation—the citizens retiring as speedily as the nature of the case would admit.

Mr. Calhoun closed the debate on Mr. Crittenden's bill, and, on the question of granting leave to introduce it being taken, it was decided in the negative:—Yeas 14, nays 26.

Mr. Webster's Resignation—Important Debate.

The Vice President laid before the Senate the resignation of Daniel Webster of his seat in that body.

Mr. Cuthbert, of Georgia, expressed his regret that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Webster) was not present, as he was desirous of putting to that gentleman some inquiries as to doctrines some time since put forth by him, in which the people of the South had a deep and vital interest, and in relation to which it had been said that the Senator had changed his opinions. If the Senator could explain in a satisfactory manner, he would stand much better with the South than he now did. Mr. Cuthbert had delayed adverting to the subject, under the impression that the Senator, being about to make his resignation today, would address the Senate in person on that occasion.

Mr. Clay expressed the deep regret he felt that the Senator from Georgia should have seized an occasion when Mr. C.'s honorable friend's absence from these halls———

Mr. Cuthbert here interposed, and protested against the idea that he had seized the opportunity of Mr. Webster's absence to make the remarks he had now done, or that it should for a moment be supposed he had ever shrunk from expressing any opinion he held in the presence of any man whom it might concern. The document on which his remarks were founded, and in regard to which he was desirous of interrogating the Senator from Massachusetts, had been in his possession last session, but he had declined at that time to use it, and it had been left behind him in the District. He had directed it to be sent to him, but this had not been done; he had since used every effort in his power to possess himself of it, and hoped soon to succeed. Mr. C. had not known till a few days since, that it was Mr Webster's intention to leave the Senate before the expiration of the session. He hoped, therefore, that the Senator from Kentucky would release him from the imputation of being unwilling to express his sentiments in that Senator's presence. It was impossible Mr C could, in this matter, be influenced by any party consideration, because, should the Senator be able satisfactorily to explain, the effect would be rather to weaken the influence of the party to which Mr. C. belonged.

Mr. Clay resumed, and said that it was far from his intention to convey the idea that the Senator from Georgia feared to put any proper queries to his friend from Massachusetts, or had seized the opportunity of his absence with the view of taking any improper advantage of that circumstance; still he could not but express his profound regret, whatever circumstances might have caused the honorable Senator to choose this moment for introducing the remarks he had made, that he had not chosen a more suitable occasion.

Mr. Cuthbert here again interposed, and inquired whether it had not been generally understood that the Senator from Massachusetts was to be in his place to-day, and to address the Senate previously to making the resignation of his seat?

Many voices cried out, "No; there has been no such understanding."

Mr. Cuthbert. There certainly has been on this side of the Senate.

Mr. Clay said he could not answer for the Senator's sources of information. That it was his friend's intention to resign his seat, was a fact which had for some time been generally known, and had been stated in the journals of the day, and the Senator had been here in his seat till near three o'clock. Mr. C. must, therefore, repeat the expression of his deep, his profound regret, that, at a moment like this, when every member of the body could not but feel the great void which had been created by the act just announced to the Senate, from the absence of that commanding eloquence and that unsurpassed logic, which had been so long and so often exerted in support of the rights and best interests of this country; in the midst of this feeling of general regret—for Mr. C. would do gentlemen on the other side the justice to believe that, notwithstanding political differences of sentiment, the feeling was fully participated in by them—that at such a moment the Senator from Georgia should have deemed it becoming, and a suitable opportunity, to introduce the subject to which he had just alluded.—The day when one of the noblest specimens of American eloquence, one of the brightest ornaments of these Halls, of his country, and of our common nature, had retired from his seat in the Senate, perhaps forever, to assume a station of still higher importance, and of still wider influence over the future welfare of this land, was certainly not a time that most gentlemen would have selected for the purpose of interrogating him as to any sentiments he might at a former time have uttered. Mr. Clay doubted its propriety at any time. The interrogatories to be put had no connection with any subject now before the Senate; and the practice had never been introduced into our American Halls of legislation to put interrogatories to ministers, as was customary in England. But if the Senator from Massachusetts had recently intimated any change of opinion in reference to the subjects to which the member from Georgia alluded, why should that gentleman doubt his sincerity? On what subject had be these doubts? Mr. C., standing in his place, could be a witness for his friend from Massachusetts, that, from his first appearance in the Senate down to this day of his regretted resignation, no sentiment had ever been advanced by him which was not perfectly catholic, and which did not regard as much the rights of the South and the great interests of the West, as those of any other portion of the Union: on the contrary, he had ever been ready alike to defend and maintain in the most determined manner the rights of every quarter of the country. He had on all occasions declared it as his sentiment, that the Constitution of the United States conferred upon Congress no power, directly or indirectly, to touch the subject to which he presumed the Senator alluded, certainly not beyond the limits of the District; and even within the District, although he might be of opinion that the mere abstract power did exist, yet he believed as strongly that it would be inexpedient to exercise it. On what subject, then, did the South want guaranties as to his course in a higher and more extended sphere of action? His elevation to that station was an homage richly due to him for services and talents unreservedly devoted to the service of the country for twenty or twenty-five years past. And the present was the first and only proof which he had ever received of the due estimation of those services by the offer of any office under the Federal Government; and Mr. C. would here publicly express his full and entire conviction that there was no subject in regard to which the South need indulge apprehension in consequence of his elevation.

Mr. Cuthbert said that the Senator from Kentucky had made a great deal out of his brief address to the Senate, having spoken of it as though he had pursued a course which was a subject of poignant regret—as if he had been guilty of some gross violation of decorum—some unpardonable outrage on public feeling; but Mr. C. was not to be imposed upon by any such affectation.

Mr. Clay. I call that Senator to order; he cannot be permitted to use such language in application to me.

Mr. Cuthbert here made some explanation, unintelligible to the reporter, but which ended with the expression, Well, then, we now understand each other. The Senator says that his friend from Massachusetts is a Senator of distinguished abilities. I acknowledge it. That those abilities have long and often been exerted here. I acknowledge it. That his opinion is of high authority. I acknowledge it. But if he entertains the most heretical and abominable opinion in relation to a subject which is of the deepest interest to a large portion of this country, am I not to dare to demand from him an explanation? That I must not dare to speak of a subject of this importance, because it does not comport with that Senator's notions of decorum! Can any man listen to this with patience? That the rights of a whole people are to be put in the scales with that Senator's ideas of delicacy and decorum? I laugh at it. I spurn at it. The interests of my constituents shall be defended by me on all occasions—by God! they shall. The gentleman does not understand to a scruple or a drachm the heresies which have been maintained by his friend; not always, by the by, his friend, if I rightly remember. The laurels of the honorable Senator from Kentucky were won by his gallant support of the late war. It was the glory of his eloquence, the fire and splendor of his genius, which inspired the hearts of his countrymen with an undying determination to resist oppression. For that he was honored then—for that he is honored now—and for that he ever will be honored Where his friend stood on that occasion, I need not say. But what is this doctrine put forth by the Senator from Massachusetts, and in regard to which I wish to interrogate him? It is proved by a document of the very highest authority. I regret I have it not now to produce, but I shall have it, and will produce it. He there asserts it as indisputable, that Congress may pass laws to prevent the transfer of slaves from one State or Territory to another!

Mr. Preston, after some remarks, which, from his position, were in a great degree inaudible at the very inconvenient seats assigned to the reporters, was understood to say that, without recognizing the right of any Senator to interrogate him as to the sentiments of an absent friend, and disclaiming any intention to make an answer for one so abundantly capable of answering for himself, as was the honorable Senator from Massachusetts, he would say that the circumstance which he understood to be alluded to by the Senator from Georgia, was one in which he had himself had some participation. He had been present at the time when that honorable Senator made the declarations having relation to the interests of the South, of which the Senator from Georgia complained, and those declarations were, to Mr. P.'s mind, satisfactory. The doctrines then advanced, were such as he, as a southern man, felt authorized to sanction, to approve, and, in some sort, to endorse. He did approve, and did endorse them. The explanations of the Senator from Massachusetts were made at Alexandria, in the presence of many thousands of southern gentlemen, and they were entirely satisfied. His opinions were there avowed openly, and he told the assembly that they should hear of them again: and those very same sentiments, *ipsissimis verbis*, were echoed amongst the mountains of New Hampshire, were reverberated along the indented shores of Massachusetts, were proclaimed on the banks of the Hudson, and again put forth in the clearest and most decisive language from the Capitol at Richmond. As a patriot and a southern man, Mr. P. had heard them with great pleasure. Whether they were the result of any change in sentiment; whether they were the product of any new light, Mr. P. neither asked nor cared, but hailed them with delight as proceeding from such a man. Whether new or old, if they were Mr. Webster's sentiments now, as he could not doubt they were, he was sure the Senator from Georgia must rejoice with him, both that they were entertained and had been thus expressed.

Mr. Rives obtained the floor, but yielded it at the earnest request of

Mr. Cuthbert, who said that he had charged these sentiments, of which he complained, openly on this floor, upon the Senator from Massachusetts some years ago, when the position of that gentleman was not so important as it had now become, and the Senator from Virginia had at that time joined him in pressing for an explanation from the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. Rives said he should like to know what was the purpose of the Senator from Georgia in thus pressing this subject of inquiry? What was his object?

Mr. Cuthbert said he would explain. He then repeated the declaration that, when pressing the charge of these opinions on the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Virginia had united with him, and had expressed to the Senator from Massachusetts his strong disapprobation of those opinions.

Mr. Rives said that the gentleman from Georgia was certainly mistaken. Mr. R. had a perfect recollection of the leading circumstances, and did not join the gentleman from Georgia, on that occasion, in charging the Senator from Massachusetts with having promulgated the obnoxious opinion that it was competent for Congress to prohibit the transportation of slaves from one State to another for sale. He had had no intimation on the subject. All he had heard was from the gentleman from Georgia himself. That Senator had asserted that the Senator from Massachusetts had, in some document adopted by a public meeting in Boston, advanced such sentiments, and this was all that Mr. R. knew about it. When that gentleman charged the fact on Mr. Webster, and pressed for an explanation, Mr. R. had been anxious to hear what reply would be made, but did not join the Senator in making the charge.

Mr. Cuthbert I did not allege that the Senator from Virginia made the charge on his own knowledge, but I say, and I ever will repeat, the Senator from Virginia did, with earnestness and with great ability, press that charge on the Senator from Massachusetts, who, in his reply, avowed the doctrine, and maintained and defended it on the constitutional power of Congress to regulate commerce between the states. I repeat, that the Senator from Virginia did enter into that debate, although I admit that he obtained the facts from me.

Mr. Rives. I had risen to perform an act of justice to the Senator from Massachusetts and to myself, when I yielded the floor to the gentleman from Georgia. And what is the result of the statement he has made? Does it sustain his assertion that I pressed the Senator from Massachusetts for an answer to his inquiry?

Mr. Cuthbert, interposing. I beg the Senator—I beg the Senate to do me justice. What I said was, that the gentleman from Virginia did press on the Senator from Massachusetts the incorrectness of these opinions, supposing him to entertain them.

Mr. Rives. Then the whole question, as between the Senator from Georgia and myself, is immaterial. I have not so minute a recollection of all the circumstances as to be able to recall every individual thing which passed; but, fortunately for the Senator from Georgia and myself, we did not speak to empty benches. There must have been others who heard and who remember what passed. I recollect having participated in a very interesting debate, to which the Senator from Massachusetts and other members of this body were parties, on different topics connected with Southern rights. On this occasion I remember it was alleged by the Senator from Georgia that the Senator from Massachusetts had advanced the doctrine that it was competent for Congress to prohibit the transportation of slaves from one state to another for sale, and that he appealed to him to say whether he had or not; but he did not recollect whether the Senator from Massachusetts had admitted or denied having done so.

[Mr. Cuthbert. No, no; he did not deny it.]

Mr Rives. Let not the Senator from Georgia involve me when he comes forward to make charges against a gentleman who is not here present to defend himself; but, if he advances a charge, and its truth is denied, then the burden of proof certainly lies on him.

[Mr. Cuthbert. I can prove it, and I will.]

M. Rives. I protest against the gentleman's drawing me in to support his accusation in a matter of which I have no knowledge. Now do I feel it to be due to the eminent public man who has just dissolved his connexion with this body, and who has been arraigned for his opinion by the Senator from Georgia in a manner which, to say the least, is rather ill-timed and unprecedented, to state what have been the declarations of his opinions, on these same questions, within my own hearing, at a very recent period. With that distinguished gentleman, I have differed, and still differ, on some important questions of public policy. But these differences have never prevented me from feeling that his presence here was one of the proudest ornaments of this Hall, and that his withdrawal from it will leave an intellectual void which generations must pass away, in the ordinary course of Providence to men, before we shall see it filled with his like again. His talents and his reputation are the common property of his country; and for one I have ever looked upon them with pride as an American citizen. If my honorable friend from Georgia——

[Mr. Cuthbert. I hope the Senator will drop the expression "friend."]

Mr. Rives. Most happily, if he says so. If the Senator from Georgia, then, had looked as inquisitively into the evidence of the opinions of the Senator from Massachusetts on this important and delicate topic, which has been given to the world during the last four or five months, as he seems to have done into those supposed to have been uttered by him twenty-odd years ago in a town-meeting of Boston, he would have seen what he has said under circumstances of the most solemn and imposing character. At the city of Richmond, in the month of October last, on the sacred portico of the Capitol of Virginia, before an assemblage of ten thousand of her freemen—beneath the light of an October sun—in the face of Heaven—he declared, in the most solemn manner, under all the responsibilities of his character and station, that it was his well-settled and unchangeable opinion that there is no power, *direct* or *indirect*, in Congress or the General Government, to interfere, *in any manner whatever, in the slightest degree, with the subject of slavery or the institutions of the South*. A declaration so broad, so complete, so unequivocal, so emphatic, proceeding from such a man, in such a presence, could not but make a profound impression. These memorable words are on record. They were taken down at the time, and they have been given to the world under the revision of the Senator from Massachusetts himself. Here, then, is the authentic and recorded evidence of the deliberate and final opinions of that distinguished gentleman on the whole of this delicate subject, and it is but an act of common justice that he should be tried and judged by them. Let the Senator from Georgia prosecute his inquiries, by referring to these recent and authentic proofs of the sentiments of the distinguished citizen of Massachusetts; and, if they should fail to satisfy him, he will have this further consolation, that, though that gentleman is removed from this theatre of his public labors, he will not be beyond the reach of any legitimate inquiries in that higher post of duty and responsibility, his accession to which has been hailed, as the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Clay) has just remarked, by the general voice of the country. He will be happy, I doubt not, to answer any inquiries which may be conveyed to him, in courteous and proper terms, from an unprejudiced source. My only regret is that he is not now here to answer the arraignment of the Senator from Georgia, face to face.

Mr. Cuthbert. None can regret it more than I; no man regrets it one ten-thousandth part as much. I tell the Senator that I have been seeking for the document on which to base my inquiry. Does the Senator believe me, or must I prove it? I repeat the assurance, that I have been waiting for that document, and that only. But I am not sorry for what has occurred. It pleases me. I am glad the attention of the country has been fixed upon the fact; it cannot now escape investigation. It will now be seen what has been said of my much-injured State—a State I love with a burning affection. I hug her to my heart in proportion as she is assailed and assaulted from abroad.

I say, then, that at a public meeting held in the city of Boston, on the subject of slavery, and for a purpose which the South cannot approve, a committee was appointed to bring in a report. The gentleman from Massachusetts was chairman of that meeting; and one of the resolutions reported by the committee was in nearly the very words uttered by him on this floor. I would have called on him for an explanation before now, but I wished first to procure the document, that I might be sure I was right. It shall yet be produced; and I say again, that I am glad the eyes of the country, the eyes of the whole world, have been turned to this proceeding, and to the heretical opinion advanced by the Senator from Massachusetts Two or three years since that Senator carefully investigated the subject of slavery, and in this document he declares it as his opinion that Congress has the constitutional authority to prevent the transportation of slaves from one State to another. It is a case made out; the proof shall be adduced, and it is of itself sufficient to excite the suspicions of the South. The opinion has been spread abroad, and it has every where been quoted on his authority.

Now, if the Senator has changed his opinion, is he not bound to retract this expression of it? If he has formerly expressed an opinion which he now knows to be false and unsound if he knows, at the same time, that that opinion, as his, has gained currency, and that it furnishes the very form on which the war is carried on against us, and if, under these circumstances, he refuses to do justice to the South, what must be his moral structure? The opinion gains authority in his own state, and it is promulgated abroad as an opinion supported by his authority. If he knows this and does not contradict it, he re-affirms it. And am I then to be told that the certain vague and general expressions used by him on the steps of the Capitol of Virginia avail to cancel all this? The cancer is spreading, it approaches the vital parts, the patient is in danger, and then we are told that there is some panacea or quack medicine which has been vended for the cure of the disease. A Senator from South Carolina put the document in my hands at the last session. I thought at that time of bringing up the Senator before the people, but the document escaped me, and I have sought it since, with the express intention to make that use of it. I say that the Senator from Massachusetts has set up doctrines which throw open all the South to her enemies, which leave us no barrier for our defence, and with nothing to prevent the sea from rushing in to overwhelm us. The mischief has been done: it has been done by the expression of that opinion: it must be retracted: forgiveness must be asked from a much injured people: there must be repentance, and not only repentance, but reform. The Senator must not profess to repent and still retain the emoluments of sin. He must not retain popularity at the North for one opinion, and tell the South that he has changed it, and holds another. I say again that I rejoice that the attention of the world has been called to this debate. The Senator has been pledged by his friend to answer. If he shall answer and retract the opinion, then his authority, in the degree in which it will now prevail, and that is but a poor degree, will atone for the mischief he has done. If he does all he possibly can to counteract its influence, then he will stand somewhat better before our people than he now does; but if he shall not—we know our enemies.

[Here the Debate was terminated by the adjournment of the Senate.]

In the House, a bill was reported from the committee on military affairs, making appropriations for various fortifications, to the amount of $1,678,000.

The bill appropriating $75,000 for continuing the exploration and survey of the N. E. boundary was passed, after various attempts to amend.

The general appropriation bill was taken up, and after remarks by several gentlemen, (the question being on reducing the fees and emoluments of district attorneys and marshals,)

Mr. Thompson, of South Carolina, took the floor. He said he was not about to make an omnibus speech; he would not follow the example of discussing every question of public policy which has occurred for the last twenty years, or which will occur for the next fifty. He would not discuss abolition; he never had, and he never would; and, besides, sir, abolition is a "dead corpse." Nor would he discuss the protective tariff policy, for that, too, is a "dead corpse." Gentlemen, with one voice, from the tariff section, tell us they wish no additional protection. I believe them, because I know them to be gentlemen; and, if I thought otherwise, I should believe them, because I know that they dare not say so here unless they expressed the opinions of their constituents. I meet them in the same spirit—in a spirit of conciliation, not of menace and defiance. I will not threaten what the South will do in an emergency which I am sure will never happen. But I feel called on, in justice to the South and to the eminent statesmen of the South in times past, to reply to some of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Sergeant.) He repeated the charge, so often made, that southern statesmen advocated the protective policy in 1816, which was the beginning, the foundation of that policy. It is a mistake, sir; and it is proper that the charge should be met. What was the condition of the country and the character of the tariff of 1816? We had a heavy debt. The question was, as the debates of that time will show, whether the double duties, the war duties should be taken off all at once or gradually—whether the public debt should be paid off speedily or not? The republicans of the South, true to one of the great cardinal principles of that party, said, pay it off as soon as possible; and with that view leave the duties at such a point as will produce an adequate revenue. The tariff of 1816 was strictly a revenue tariff—was wisely adjusted with that view. It was not a question of increasing, but of diminishing duties. The only question was, shall the duties, the war duties, come off all at once or gradually? Money was wanted, and it was thus raised. It is true that a great, an influential, but an incidental, consideration was, that the manufacturing interest would be thereby sustained, and not subjected to the collapse of an immediate reduction. They acted wisely, patriotically, and disinterestedly. It was one of the great interests of the country; it was right to look to it as such, and to regard it as they did, in a new adjustment strictly for revenue, as it was. We of the South had no manufactures; we were not interested in it further than in sustaining a great interest of the country—an interest, too, which had grown up during the war; and it is well known that the republicans of the North, the best portion of the republican party, went into the manufacturing business very much from high and patriotic feelings, to sustain the country in that conflict.—But, sir, the tariff of 1816 was no protective tariff. The articles bearing the highest duties were unprotected articles. I would gladly now adopt that tariff as the basis of a permanent settlement of this question. It would be better for us than the compromise. In the discussions of 1833, a Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Calhoun) offered to adopt the tariff of 1816 as the basis of an adjustment. Is there, then, any inconsistency in advocating then the same thing that we do now? Why, sir, to ask us now, when we owe no large debt, to impose high duties, because when we were in debt we agreed to moderate duties, would not be exceeded in absurdity by the physician who, when I was sick last year, gave me ten drops of laudanum to make me sleep, if he should now, when I am well, ask me to take an ounce to kill me, and reproach me for inconsistency because I would not do it.

The remarks made by other gentlemen were not of general interest.

TUESDAY, Feb. 23.

In the Senate, Mr. Prentiss presented the petition of citizens of the county of Chatauque and State of New-York, and the memorial of citizens of the towns of Collins and Barnet, in the same State, remonstrating against the execution of the late treaty with the Seneca Indians.

In the House, the civil and diplomatic appropriation bill was again discussed, with much earnestness. The question was on the proposed reduction of the emoluments of postmasters, collectors, and other officers.

The appropriation for the New-York Custom House was objected to, and much conversation took place concerning it. It was stated that it had cost a million of dollars, and was still not half large enough for the business of the port of New-York. The extravagance of the Boston Custom House, squat on a little narrow, pent up spot with its granite porticos, and marble capitals, was severely commented on—but the items all passed through.

An amendment was offered appropriating six thousand dollars to buy chamber furniture, of American manufacture, for the President's House. It was stated that there were but three beds in the mansion; that it was destitute of furniture necessary to the comfort of a family; that though the furniture had cost over a hundred thousand dollars, it was worth little, and required renewal, &c. The allowance made, in Mr. Van Buren's time, for furniture, was about twenty-seven thousand dollars—all of which was expended in two rooms. Many of the rooms, in the mansion, have never been furnished at all. Mr. J. Q. Adams carried his own furniture into the House, and Jackson and Van Buren, being single men, had no need of many furnished chambers.

Mr. Wise opposed the item;—he would not give another cent for that House unless Gen. Harrison should ask for it as necessary.

Mr. Alford moved to sell the "*gold spoons*" and other useless articles, and with the proceeds to purchase necessary furniture.

Mr. Lincoln stated, on the authority of official documents, that there was not a "*gold spoon*" in the House—that they were silver-gilt.

Mr. Wise said—either there has been great extravagance in the furniture of the Executive mansion, or our allegations to that effect were unfounded.

Some called for the reading of "Ogle's Speech," and others suggested that the furniture may have been stolen. Mr. Stanley said, the large sums heretofore appropriated, had been improvidently and foolishly expended.

Mr. Alford's amendment was rejected, and the item was agreed to. The House adjourned, after reporting the bill, at 9 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 24.

The Senate was engaged the greater part of the day on the bill for rechartering the Banks of the District of Columbia.

In the House, the civil and diplomatic appropriation bill was passed. The whole day was occupied in the consideration of the amendments reported from the Committee of the whole, and the yeas and nays were taken on nearly every one of them.

The proviso limiting the amount of the fees and emoluments of the District Attorneys, Clerks and Marshals, was concurred in by a very large majority. Another amendment, restricting the Postmasters from receiving more than three thousand dollars a year from boxes, branch post-offices, &c., or more than five thousand in the aggregate, from all sources, was almost unanimously concurred in.

THURSDAY, Feb. 25.

In the Senate there was little business of public interest transacted.

The House, to-day, took up the Navy Appropriation Bill, in Committee of the whole. Mr. Saltonstall moved to increase the appropriation from $1,425,000 to $2,000,000. A long debate took place on this motion, and Mr. Mallory moved to amend it by providing that $500,000 of the sum be appropriated to the building of steam vessels.

FRIDAY, Feb. 26.

In the Senate, Mr. Roane sent to the Chair a letter from the Chief Justice announcing the death of Judge Barbour, and the preparations that were made for the funeral. After the letter was read, Mr. Roane rose and paid a tribute to the worth of the deceased, remarking that his virtues, and his talents, had claimed for him the affection of his countrymen while living, and regret for his death.

Mr. R. moved that the Senate adjourn at 2 o'clock P. M. to attend the remains of the deceased to the steamboat by which they were to be carried to the family seat in Orange County, Virginia which motion was agreed to.

One or two bills were ordered to be engrossed, after which the Bankrupt Bill was taken up, and Mr. Clay of Alabama addressed the Senate until the hour for adjournment chiefly against the amendment subjecting Banks to the compulsory process.

In the House, the death of Judge Barbour was announced by Mr. Banks, who moved a resolution that the House adjourn at 2 o'clock in order to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Mr. Wise concurred in every thing that was said by Mr. Banks, of the talents, the virtues, and the worth, public and private, of Judge Barbour, and his feelings were deeply affected at the loss his friends and his country had sustained—but a mightier than he had fallen, and no such notice of his death was taken. He alluded to the illustrious John Marshal, Chief Justice of the same Court. He could not vote for honors to the memory of Judge Barbour which had not been bestowed on the memory of Chief Justice Marshall. He asked his colleague to withdraw the resolution, and content himself with the annunciation of the decease of the Judge.

The resolution was adopted.

SATURDAY, Feb. 27.

In the Senate a good many bills were passed that had been ordered to be engrossed on a prior day, the only one arrested on its passage was that offered by Mr. Wall, relating to the considering of all children born out of the U. States of American parents to be entitled to all the privileges of American citizens. This was supposed to involve important principles, and was laid on the table for the present session.

The bill making appropriations for the civil diplomatic expenses of the government for 1841, was reported from the committee on finance with divers amendments, which were ordered to be printed.

The Bill to amend the judicial system of the United States, was ordered to be engrossed by quite a large majority, which if it passes the other house will materially affect the hopes of some aspirants for the judgeship vacated by the death of Judge Barbour. This Bill changes the district—viz., it gives Virginia to Maryland—and North Carolina to South Carolina, and this was so strongly supported as well by those in power as those out that it rendered extremely probable that it will become a law.

Among the memorials was one presented by Mr. Tappan from Joshua Leavitt, praying the interference of Congress in endeavoring to procure an equitable and adequate market for Wheat. This memorial was refered to the committee on Agriculture at the suggestion of Dr. Linn, who stands at the head of that Committee.

A resolution was introduced by Mr. King which met the unanimous consent of the Senate, to allow pay to such Senators as were detained by the late storm and could not reach the seat of Government on the 1st day of the session.

The House did considerable business. They passed the Navy bill, and then took up the Army bill and passed that. The Indian bill was but a cherry bite—they passed that too, and adjourned in good season—about 8 o'clock.

Taxing Luxuries.—The Louisville Advertiser says that "the Kentucky House of Representatives have added to a new tax bill upon carriages and gold watches, a proposition to tax 'other luxuries, such as whiskey, tobacco and hemp!' Whiskey and tobacco luxuries? One is an unmitigated curse, and the other an intolerable nuisance! Hemp a luxury? Why, it is an article of *indispensable necessity*, as long as the *whiskey* and *tobacco* are used.

A Rare Chance.—A bill is before the British Parliament, for the incorporation of a joint stock company, called the "British India Sugar Company." It is said the profits for many years cannot be less than from fifty to seventy per cent.

NEW-YORK LEGISLATURE.

MONDAY, Feb. 22.

This being the anniversary of the birth of Washington, neither the Senate nor the Assembly were in session.

TUESDAY, Feb. 23.

In the Senate, the proceedings were unimportant.

In the Assembly, a large number of petitions was received for and against the proposal to build a bridge across the Hudson at Albany. Mr. Strong presented a petition for the repeal of the nine months slavery law.

Mr. Skillman offered a resolution directing the clerk to cause a portion of the gentlemen's gallery to be set apart exclusively for persons of color, to enclose the same with a suitable railing, and to cause a notice to be affixed at the entrance, to the effect that all persons of color attending as spectators, are required to confine themselves to that portion of the gallery set apart for their use.

Mr. French moved to lay the resolution on the table. Mr. Skillman demanded the ayes and noes, and they were ordered, and

The house refused to lay on the table; ayes 38, noes 47, and the resolution was adopted, 43 to 39.

[This is certainly a fine touch of republicanism!—*Ed. Standard.*]

The remainder of the proceedings to day were not of great importance.

WEDNESDAY, Feb, 24.

In the Senate, the proceedings were not very important.

In the House, a large number of petitions was received, on a great variety of subjects.

The Seneca Treaty.

Mr. Eldridge called up the report of the committee on Indian affairs made under an order of the house, in relation to the late treaty with the Senecas—which report concludes with recommending the passage of certain resolutions urging upon Congress to withhold the appropriation necessary to carry the treaty into effect, until the circumstances under which it was made shall be fully investigated and until it shall satisfactorily appear that it was voluntarily assented to by a majority of the nation, and that such assent was fairly obtained.

There was considerable debate between Messrs. Swackhammer, Chatfield, Howe, McMurray, Scott, Eldridge, Taylor, &c; but no question was taken.

THURSDAY, Feb. 25.

The proceedings of both houses were unimportant.

FRIDAY, Feb. 26.

In the Senate, nothing was done of general interest.

In the Assembly, Mr. O'Sullivan laid on the table resolutions declaratory of the doctrines of the Peace Society, which on his motion, were laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

SATURDAY, Feb. 27.

In the Senate, Mr Taylor reported a bill to amend the registry law by requiring the registry to be made once in three years instead of every year. It was made the order of the day for Wednesday.

In the Assembly, Mr. Culver introduced a resolution rescinding the order, heretofore adopted causing a special place to be set apart in the gallery, for colored persons.

Mr. French had been surprized at the passage of the original resolution, and to expedite its recision moved the previous question.

The House sustained the call. Ayes 48, noes 37.

Mr. French called for the ayes and nays which being ordered and the question taken resulted in the adoption of the resolution: 58 to 42.

Mr. L. S. Chatfield offered a resolution that the clerk be directed to invite the colored clergymen in this city to attend in their turn and officiate at the opening of the daily sessions of the House with prayer.

Mr. McMurray deemed this resolution entirely unnecessary, as the general resolution inviting clergymen (adopted at the commencement of the session) included all the clergymen in the city without distinction.

Mr. French stated that the clerk had invited the only colored Minister now in the city, as he had the other clergymen, which invitation had been declined.

Mr. Duer thought that in the present state of feeling in the community no good would arise from the officiating of a colored clergyman; on the contrary it will only give occasion for ridicule. He said this not out of disrespect to these men, but out of a belief that the real object of the prayer daily offered in this House would not be promoted by the course suggested by the resolution.

Mr. French moved to amend by striking out all after the word resolved, and insert as follows: that if the clerk has not already literally carried out the resolution of this House, directing him to invite the several clergymen in this city, having charge of christian congregations, that he be instructed to do so.

Mr. Wier moved the previous question, but the House refused to second the call—31 only rising in favor.

Mr. McMurray argued the whole question of the propriety of the officiating of colored clergymen, at considerable length. He believed the Supreme Ruler of the universe regarded much more the spirit of the man who offered prayer, than his complexion or race; but he felt compelled to oppose the resolution as unnecessary and uncalled for.

Mr. Wier rose to deny that the constituents of the gentleman last up (Mr. McMurray,) were truly represented by the remarks which he had just uttered. He (Mr. W.) must interpose his dissent to the doctrines advanced by Mr. McM.

Mr. McMurray believed that his constituents would be more likely to approve the remarks he had uttered, than those which the gentleman from New-York (Mr. Wier) had put forth. The people of New-York were in favor of human rights, in their widest and most liberal sense.

The debate was continued by Mr. Richmond and by Mr. Eldredge, who moved the previous question.

The House sustained the call, and the question being on the resolution as offered by Mr. L. S. Chatfield, it was lost: ayes 3, Messrs. Aiken, Gillett, and Scott; noes! 94.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Steamer Swan.—This boat, so well known as running between this city and Amboy, on the morning line to Philadelphia, left the pier as usual on Saturday morning at 7 o'clock, in a very dense fog, and in spite of all carefulness, ran upon Bergen Point Reef, opposite New Brighton at half past seven o'clock. The boat filled directly to the level of the external water. The passengers, fifty-three in number, were brought up to Jersey City, by the Staten Islander, one of the Quarantine ferry boats, but too late as it proved for the 9 o'clock Rail Road train for Philadelphia. The passengers received no personal injury, and the large quantity of freight on deck, remained above the water.—*Jour. Com.*

The Collector of New York.—Various rumors are afloat in conversation, and some have been put in print, respecting the accounts of this officer with the Government. We are able to say that there is a difference of opinion between him and the Secretary of the Treasury, about sundry items of his accounts for disbursements, fees, &c., amounting to over $40,000. The questions arise out of differences in the interpretation of the law.—*Jour. Com.*

Sudden Developement of St. Vitus' Dance.—A paper in the Western part of New-York, Danville, records the singular fact, that a little boy was so much alarmed at seeing a mendicant, who had this disease, come suddenly into a room, that he ran out of the apartment, agitated and greatly frightened. From that period he has had the same malady precisely—and measures of treatment have been adopted to overcome, if possible, his unlooked for calamity.—*Medical Intelligencer.*

The British Navy.—According to an official return of the naval force of Great Britain on the 1st of January, 1841, it appears that there are 30 admirals, 61 vice-admirals, 95 rear-admirals, 683 captains of retired half pay, 49 retired captains, commanders under the order in Council of 1840, 759 commanders, 300 retired commanders on half pay, 7 naval knights of Windsor, lieutenants, 2,752 lieutenants on half pay, 7 masters superannuated, 452 masters for service on half pay; 528 pursers on half pay, 1,086 medical officers, 297 officers of marines, 474 officers of marine artillery, and 90 companies of marines. The British navy, the most extensive in the world, consists of 584 ships of war, mounting from 10 to 120 guns each, of various calibre; of these 84 are armed steam vessels, built on the most approved principles for active service. This immense fleet is manned by 20,000 able bodied seamen, 2,000 stout lads, and 10,000 Royal marines.—*Boston Merc. Journal.*

Wabash Treaty—The Senate has ratified, with some slight amendments, the late treaty made at the Forks of the Wabash river, in the state of Indiana, with the Miami Indians. This was a most important measure to the State, as well as to the Indians, as by it the title to the remaining lands of those Indians laying in that state, being about 500,000 acres, has extinguished, and the removal of the Indians at an early day to the lands set apart for them beyond the Mississippi river has been secured.—*Globe.*

Appaling Boast.—During the discussion between Doctors Draper and Watson, at Boston, on the use of the lancet and mercury, of which we have before spoken. Dr. Watson, in the course of his remarks, stated that in the course of four years and a half, he had taken from the citizens of Boston and vicinity, *one hundred barrels of blood!* and had administered *forty-nine pounds of mercury!* How many persons had fallen victims to this abominable mode of practice was not stated. But one person came forward, a mere skeleton, evidently standing on the brink of the grave, to hear testimony to the pernicious consequences of his "Dr. Watsons'a" mode of treating diseases. He told a piteous tale, which had the effect of exciting the indignation of the audience against this letter of blood and administerer of mercury, and the meeting was broken up in disorder.—*Sun.*

Portuguese Slave Trade.—The late French papers says that the 200 slaves and young Arabs found on board the ship taken by the Prevoyante, and carried into the island of Bourbon, were in a perfect state of nakedness and starvation, so that the magistrates of the island were forced to clothe as well as feed them. The Arabs were free men, whom the Portuguese pirates had carried of by force and reduced to slavery.

Cheap Line.—A new line of Steamboats, composed of the Rochester, North America, and south America, is formed to run on the Hudson River, the ensuing summer, from the foot of Liberty street, to Albany, at the low fare of one dollar.

A most disgraceful occurrence took place in the Maine House of Representatives on Saturday last. Some party matter was before the House and after a long discussion, a quorum not being present, an order was issued not to allow any individual to pass out without the permission of the House. A gentleman came in, and not knowing the order, passed out in a few moments. At this, Delesdernier, a ruffian, brutally attacked and beat the door-keeper, Mr. Ellis, and then cowardly ran to his seat, and sought the protection of the House. Comment on such conduct is unnecessary.

Indian Talk.—Yesterday afternoon, Gov. Lucas held a talk with Hardfish and other Chiefs, and several braves of the Sac and Fox nation.

The Indians complained that their annuities for the year have not yet been paid. It appears that in September last, Major Pilcher, agent for that purpose, brought to the Sac Fox agency, in bank bills, the amount due the Indians—but owing to the unhappy division among themselves, the payment for the time was postponed until the Indians could agree among themselves as to how the money could be divided—some contending that it should be paid to the Chiefs, and others that it should be paid to heads of families Besides, a majority of them refused to receive the bills, but demanded specie. Under these circumstances, Major Pilcher returned to St. Louis—and it was understood that he would return again to the Agency in twenty days with the specie—which he has up to this date refused to do, or to forward the funds. The Indians censure Capt. Beach, their Agent, as the principal cause of their disappointment. We know not with what propriety this charge may be made—but we must confess that we have our doubts whether there is not something "rotten in Denmark,"—there is a strong appearance of an unjust influence exercised against the Indians, most probably by the American Fur Company.

The Governor informed them that he had received instructions under which the Indians should receive their money in such manner as they desired—the amount due to the several hands to be paid as they might respectfully demand, either to Chiefs or heads of families. They seemed to satisfied with this arrangement—but wished it to be distinctly understood that they no longer acknowledged Keokuck as the head of their nation—*Burlington, (Iowa) Gazette of Jan. 30.*

The Ladies at the White House—The lady who is to be at the head of the domestic affairs on the coming in of the new Administration, is the widow of Wm. Harrison, the son of the President, who died a few months ago. There will be associated with her, Mrs. Taylor, the youngest daughter of Gen. Harrison, and Mrs. Taylor the mother of the last mentioned lady's husband. The General's wife intends to remain the mistress of North Bend, and at the White House will be a visiter. The General's Private secretary will be his son in law, Mr. Taylor.

Judge Barbour was from Virginia. He entered Congress, in the House of Representatives, in the year 1841, and soon signalized himself by considerable ability in debate. He remained in Congress for a number of years, a part of which time he filled the office of Speaker of the House.

Proposed Impeachment.—The legislature of Mississippi have passed resolutions requesting their Representatives in Congress to prepare articles of impeachment against Justice McKinley, of the U. S. Supreme Court. The Governor has approved the resolutions. These resolutions have their origin in the refusal of Judge McKinley to hold the Circuit Court in Mississippi, as his duty required.

An act has passed the legislature of the State of Louisiana, to authorize the taking of the sense of the people of that State as to the propriety of calling a Convention of the people to alter its Constitution.

Mr. B. J. Seward, a brother of the Governor of this State, and spoken of as a most estimable young man, died on Wednesday morning last, at the residence of his father, in Orange county.

Important News.—The Madisonian of Saturday publishes the following extract of a letter, dated

Halifax, (N. S.) Feb. 19, 1841.

"Several regiments have been ordered to New-Brunswick, and we are informed that orders have been sent from the home government to the West Indies, to embark all the regular troops there for this place; the island is to be garrisoned by the militia.

A Rival for J. Q. Adams.—Mr. Casey, of Illinois, is said to be the most attentive member of Congress—more faithful in attendance to his legislative duties even than Mr. Adams. During the 8 years that he has been a member of the House he has been abroad only a day and a half, and has voted on *every question* (!) taken, with that exception.

John Sloane was elected Secretary of State of Ohio, in joint of the Senate and Assembly, on the 20th February.

FAIR

FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE

American Anti-Slavery Society.

IN Accordance with the recommendation of the Manhattan Anti-Slavery Society, there will be a Fair held in the city of New-York during the week of the anniversaries, in May next. The friends of the anti-slavery cause are solicited for contributions, either in money or goods. Articles of clothing,—such as hats, shoes, stockings, 'kerchiefs, gloves, children's frocks, aprons, shirts, fancy articles, toys, &c. &c., will be gratefully acknowledged. A more particular list will be made out, of the most desirable articles, and it is hoped that the anti-slavery women of the country will be prompt in forwarding such as they can, and in promoting the most liberal contributions.

ALMIRA VAN RENSSELAER,
RACHEL ROBY,
A. H. GIBBONS,
MERCY POWELL,
M. A. W. JOHNSON,
LYDIA MARIA CHILD,
ANNE WARREN WESTON,
ANNA BUNIE,
JANE DAVIS,
SARAH H. SOUTHWICK.

New-York, March 4, 1841.

Garden and Farm Seeds;

WARRANTED THE GROWTH OF 1840.

For sale at the Seed store No. 45 North Market street, Boston.

THE Subscriber has just completed his assortment of seeds for the coming season, and is ready to supply orders to any amount, for farm, garden, and flower seeds, both to traders and to farmers.

The seeds offered are selected with great care, raised by experienced seed growers in the vicinity of Boston, New Hampshire, and in Maine, and every precaution has been used to obtain *pure* and *perfect* seeds. It is confident that satisfaction will be given to purchasers

Garden Seeds.

The assortment of garden seeds comprises every variety of seeds that is worthy of cultivation.

Seeds by the quantity, assorted to suit the different markets

Boxes of seeds for retailing, neatly prepared, at 6 cents per paper, with printed directions for their culture. variously assorted, from $10 per box and upwards: a liberal discount will be made to dealers.

Farm Seeds.

An excellent and very select assortment of improved field seeds, comprising the best assortment of wheat, rye, barley, corn, oats, grass seeds, root seeds, &c. &c. &c.

Farmers who intend to change their seed, are invited to call and examine.

Flower seeds, roots, shrubs, vines and trees of all kinds furnished to order.

Catalogues of the whole may be obtained on application.

Orders by wholesale and retail are respectfully solicited.

CHARLES P. BOSSON, *Seedsman*,
No. 45 North Market street, Boston.
February 18, 1841. 6t

Channing's New Work on EMANCIPATION.

JUST PUBLISHED, by the American Anti-slavery Society, and for sale at the Office, No. 143 Nassau street New-York, Channing's new work on Emancipation, a neat 18 mo. pamphlet of 72 pages. A cheaper publication was never issued from the anti-slavery press It will be sold at 12 1-2 cents, a single copy, and at 10 dollars a hundred.

Those who wish to supply themselves with this valuable production, would do well to send orders promptly.

Terms Cash only.

NEW WORK.

A SCRIPTURE MANUAL, containing 435 questions on theological and moral subjects, alphabetically arranged: designed to facilitate the finding of proof texts.—BY CHARLES SIMMONS. Price 62 cents single, 56 cents by the half dozen, and 50 cents each by the dozen. Just published and for sale at the following places in Nassau st.: Gould, Newman & Saxton, No. 91—Samuel F. Foster, No. 131—Isaac T. Hopper, No. 143, and Scofield & Voorhies, No. 46

New-York, January, 1841. 4w

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

Oliver Johnson & Geo. F. White.

THIS Day published, and for sale, by Oliver Johnson, at 143 Nassau street, a duodecimo pamphlet of 48 pages, entitled, "Correspondence between Oliver Johnson and George F. White, a minister of the Society of Friends; with an Appendix." Price 12 1-2 cents single—10 copies for $1.

New-York, Feb. 25.

To Landlords and Tenants.

THE SUBSCRIBER will receive agencies for renting houses, stores, and tenements at Hutson's Intelligence Office, No. 560½ Pearl street. When houses are registered, or application made by tenants, no charge is made unless suited.

Feb. 25, 1841. P. A. BELL.

LIBERTY AND EQUALITY

From the Christian Register.

The Home of Peace.

I sat in the moonlight one summer's eve,
When the winds had gone to rest,
And the birds had hushed their twilight song,
And sought their leafy nest—
And nature was sleeping in calm repose,
And I could plainly see,
How all things lay in the lap of peace—
Yet came no peace to me.

I followed the bird, when she led me on,
Far down the stilly glen—
Till I came to a spot, where ne'er before
The feet of man had been—
So still you could hear when the dew-drop fell
From off the shady tree—
But vainly sought I the soothing peace
That might not come to me.

I sat where the waters were calm and smooth,
As far as eye could reach,
And I heard no sound, save the wavelet's dash,
Along the sandy beech—
And I sat all day and listened there;
The music of the sea—
'Twas soothing to the wearied sense,
But brought no peace to me.

And when evening came, I turned me home,
With wearied steps, and slow—
For my soul was fainting with distrust,
And my heart was beating low.
I saw there was rest for the peaceful stars—
I looked along the lea;
'Twas quiet all, and then I cried,
"Is there no peace for me!"

Then a voice replied, in accents low—
A voice I'll ne'er forget—
All other sounds are gone, but still
That voice is sounding yet—
"Turn, child," it said, "to thy prisoned heart,
That pants to be all free—
And when its sinful thrall is burst,
There shall be peace for thee!"

Power and Gentleness,

OR THE CATARACT AND THE STREAMLET

BY BERNARD BARTON.

Noble the mountain stream,
Bursting in grandeur from its vantage ground;
Glory is in its gleam
Of brightness;—thunder in its deafening sound.

Mark, how its foamy spray,
Tinged by the sunbeams with reflected dyes,
Mimics the bow of day,
Arching in majesty the vaulted skies,—

Thence, in a summer shower,
Sweeping the rocks around;—O! tell me where
Could majesty and power
Be clothed in forms more beautifully fair?

Yet lovelier, in my view,
The streamlet, flowing silently serene;
Traced by the brighter hue,
And livelier growth it gives: itself unseen!

It flows through flowery meads,
Gladdening the herds which on its margin browse;
Its quiet beauty feeds
The alders that o'ershade it with their boughs.

Gently it murmurs by
The village churchyard; its low, plaintive tone,
A dirge-like melody,
For worth and beauty modest as its own.

More gaily now it sweeps
By the small schoolhouse, in the sunshine bright;
And o'er the pebbles leaps;
Like happy hearts by holiday made light.

May not its course express,
In characters which they who run may read,
The charms of gentleness,
Were but its still small voice allowed to plead?

What are the troubles gained
By power alone, with all its noise and strife,
To that meek wreath, unstained,
Won by the charities that gladden life?

Niagara's streams might fail,
And human happiness be undisturbed,
But Egypt would turn pale,
Were her still Nile's o'erflowing bounty curbed!

The Indian Hunter.

BY H. W. LONGFELLOW.

When the summer harvest was gather'd in,
And the sheaf of the gleaner grew white and thin,
And the plowshare was in its furrow left,
Where the stubble land had been lately cleft,
An Indian hunter, with unstrung bow,
Looked down where the valley lay stretch'd below.

He was a stranger, and all that day
Had been out on the hills, a perilous way,
But the foot of the deer was far and fleet,
And the wolf kept aloof from the hunter's feet,
And bitter feelings pass'd o'er him then,
As he stood by the populous haunts of men.

The winds of autumn came over the woods,
As the sun stole out from their solitudes,
The moss was white on the maple's trunk,
And dead from its arms the pale vine shrunk,
And ripen'd the mellow fruit hung, and red
Were the trees' withered leaves around it shed.

The foot of the reaper moved slow on the lawn,
And the sickle cut down the yellow corn—
The mower sung loud by the meadow side,
Where the mists of evening were spreading wide,
And the voice of the herdsman came up the lea,
And the dance went round by the greenwood tree.

When the hunter turned away from that scene,
Where the home of his fathers once had been,
And heard by the distant and measured stroke,
That the *woodman* hew'd down the giant oak,
And burning thoughts flash'd o'er his mind,
Of the white man's faith and love unkind.

The moon of the harvest grew high and bright,
As her golden horn pierced the cloud of white—
A footstep was heard in the rustling brake,
Where the beach o'ershadowed the misty lake,
And a *mourning* voice and a plunge from shore,
And the hunter was seen on the hills no more.

When years had passed on, by that still lake-side,
The fisher looked down through the silver tide,
And there, on the smooth yellow sand displayed,
A skeleton wasted and white was laid,
And 'twas seen, as the waters moved deep and slow,
That the hand was still grasping a hunter's bow.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Common Schools.

One of the most gratifying documents that has fallen under our eye in a long time is the report of Mr. Spencer, Secretary of State and ex-officio Superintendent of Common Schools. He is one of the ablest men in the State, and certainly the ablest connected with the administration at Albany. This alone would be sufficient to secure an attentive perusal of the document; but it is the intelligence which it embodies, the facts which it states, that will be most gratifying. It is, indeed, a proud distinction which the Empire State may claim when she can say to the world, that the number of children which have received instruction in her common schools in the course of a single year is more than one-fourth of the whole number of her inhabitants! Yet this she does say, and that too, while a large portion of her territory is comparatively new.

The whole number of school districts in the state on the 1st of July, 1840, was 10,769, being an increase from the previous year of 63. The number of children in the state over 5 and under 16 years of age, exclusive of the city of New-York on the 31st Dec. 1839, was 592,564. The number of children instructed in the common schools during the year was 572,995 Increase from the previous year 15,776. The average term during which the schools were kept was 8 months. The population of the state, as ascertained by the late census, is 2,432,835. Deducting the population of New-York, 312,833, leaves 2,120,002. It will be seen, then, that the number of children attending school out of New-York is more that one-fourth the whole number of inhabitants. The Superintendent justly remarks that "it is a subject of congratulation, that so many children of the republic have had the school room opened to them; and although it may not have afforded the high degree of instruction which may be desirable, yet much is gained by giving them the opportunity of learning something. They have acquired the elements; the good seed is sown; and, matured by genial institutions, it will germinate, and grow, and expand, even by its own force. What is thus obtained can never be lost; and it furnishes the foundation for advancement and progress by the gradually improving standard of education."

The productive capital of the common school fund amounts to, $2,033,807 95. It also has the revenue arising from $3,583,333 34 of the surplus revenue of the United States, which were deposited in the state treasury in 1837. The school fund therefore has the benefit of the revenue yielded by a capital of $5,617,141 29.

The following sums were raised and appropriated to common schools in 1839:

Paid from the state treasury,	$275,000 00
Raised by supervisors,	244,747 04
Voluntary tax in towns,	5,896 27
Derived from local funds,	20,531 65
Under special statutes in New-York,	72,651 00
do in Brooklyn,	8,696 26
do in Albany,	3,556 40
do in Buffalo,	1,2 8 52
Balance in hands of Commissioners,	1,674 91
Total for 1839,	$634,042 01
Of the sum distributed, there was paid for teachers' wages,	535,429 79
Paid by individuals for the same purpose,	476,443 27
Total paid to teachers,	$1,011,873 06

The superintendent is of opinion that valuable results are gained by not making the schools entirely free, but leaving a small portion of the expense to be paid by the inhabitants of each district. This policy secures greater care and attention to the good management of the schools on the part of those upon whom the duty immediately falls. It is a very gratifying fact that one great cause of complaint which formerly tended to lower the character of these schools, is fast disappearing—we mean inadequate salaries to teachers. The report contains a table showing the average amounts paid to teachers during the last 10 years. In 1831, the average amount per month was but $11 85. From that time till the present the rate has been gradually increasing, until in 1839 it was $18 per month. The consequence is, that we have better teachers, better schools, and better scholars. We have not space to follow out the details of this very able report, and must content ourselves with saying that it presents our system in a more flattering condition than the most sanguine could have anticipated. The example will sooner or later produce a happy influence upon every state in the Union.—*Sun.*

From the Durham (Eng.) Chronicle.

Mutual Forbearance Essential to Happiness.

> "Brutus hath rived my heart:
> "A friend should bear his friend's infirmities,
> "And Brutus makes mine greater than they are"
> SHAKSPEARE.

The height of material structures is regulated by accessions of bulk, to which it bears a strict relation; but the happiness of the mind is capable of vast expansion, by causes apparently quite inadequate. In this way, nothing is more effective than mutual forbearance towards each other's tempers and failings,—provided we do not go so far as to countenance vice,—and mutual consideration for individual judgment. Were these very easy, but truly Christian feelings, more generally cultivated, how many additional comforts would spring up among us, and how many noxious, evil-bearing plants be rooted up from the bosom of society!

Take, for example, the case of fellow-workmen. Their condition is improved in every respect by a simple desire to be on good terms with, and to be of service to, each other. Services once rendered, secure future assistance: they give a man a reversionary claim upon the aid of his fellows. A current of good-will perpetually flows among a body of men thus circumstanced, which, like the genial air of a summer's day, diffuses a general warmth around. Not only, however, ought mutual usefulness to be aimed at, but mutual toleration. All should respect the independence of each: and a majority should allow the minority undisturbed assertion of opinion. The convictions of the mind repudiate external interference; and though one man's sense of propriety differ from that of a dozen of his shopmates, they are bound in duty to respect his right of self-thought. He is accountable to society, and to God, and not to any number of persons, with whom circumstances have brought him in contact, for the sentiments he holds, and the conduct he bases upon them. The non-recognition of this principle is fraught with mischief. It destroys personal independence, and debases men into the condition of tyrants and slaves. The denial of the right of individual judgment leads to enormous criminality. From it have sprung millions of wrongs inflicted on humanity in the names of religion and government; and it is the origin of all the crimes that have attended the proceedings of secret societies, established for regulating wages, and other matters, incident to the pursuits of a trading community. No man, or body of men, has the least claim to regulate the business views of any other man. To resort to violence for that purpose, is both guilty and foolish. Unjust coercion ever defeats itself. It "returns to plague the inventor." Why have Trade Unions always been unsuccessful? Because those who are agreed among themselves, never try to gain their object without seeking to compel the assent of others, who disagree with them. The firm-minded resist the attempted compulsion, and become liable to proscription and insult, if not to murder: the timid yield, and fill the ranks of the Unionists with traitors. Can want of success—of success thus sought—be a marvel? No, truly. If working-men clearly put themselves in the right, they will win cooperation, and need not act tyrannically or cruelly to obtain it. But let their proposed measures be what they may, their realization will only be retarded by want of forbearance towards others in regard to them. If they cannot be obtained without the converse of this, their attainment would inevitably prove a curse to others, and certainly not a blessing to those who seek them.

Among mankind altogether, harsh judgment of human frailty, and a disposition to control the operations of thought, are incessantly betraying their jaundiced features. Humility is about the rarest virtue extant. Every one of us is too prone to think himself right, and his neighbor wrong: to act the Pharisee, and condemn the Publican. We have very little notion of bearing with each other's infirmities; and if we have any, "it is like an ill-roasted apple—all one side." We cry, "Bear with us;" but shew a very halting inclination to bear with others. We talk of Christianity, but fail to put its precepts into practice. We do all this—quite forgetting that the very essence of social happiness lies in conduct the very reverse. What a heavenly frame of mind does that man enjoy, who, endeavoring to perform his own duty, but confessing his extreme liability to err, has a heart filled with love for his fellow-creatures;—with sorrow for their failings, as for his own; with grief for their *afflictions*; with joy for their prosperity; and with unaffected regard for their sincerely expressed opinions! The very fountain of true religion dwells in such a man. It is practical and heart-felt, and spreads itself around him in every direction. The lonely gloom of the cloister is its destruction. It cannot flow, but is chilled to iciness, unless it have room to meander among the feelings and affections of men. Mere book-learning does it little service. It is an affair of the heart, not of the head. It rejoices in evincing itself in a thousand little acts of kindness, forbearance, self sacrifice, and patient endurance of perversity and self will; and thereby indicating a spirit of undeviating desire to respect the feelings, and to advance the happiness of others.

In no condition of life is the mutual forbearance of which I have spoken more necessary than in the marriage state. An uncomfortably situated working man may better his condition by change of employment; but no such resource is open to the miserable couple who are indisposed to overlook each other's infirmities of temper or conduct. As well may you expect a dog to be comfortable with an old pan tied to his tail, as a man who is tied to a wife of this description; and on the other hand, if you see a female united to a fellow

> ——"As full of quarrel and offence
> "As my young mistress' dog,"

depend upon it she is a doomed wretch for life. It is a most astonishing perversity of mind that thus leads to the wreck of a family's peace. What have they to do but to be mutually accommodating; to consent to give and take a little, as circumstances require; to encourage a community of feeling for each other's happiness, as well as interest; to make the best, indeed, of what may otherwise certainly be a very bad bargain; and, having taken each other "for better, for worse," to resolve

> —— "To throw away the worser part,
> "And live the better with the *better-half?*"

The cat-and-dog life some married people lead, simply from the non-observance of this accomodating principle, is truly intolerable; and yet it must be borne! The mischief is, that people will not see into the folly of it, nor consent to put a check upon their words and feelings, although disgust and bitterness reign triumphant so long as they neglect to do so. Who have greater interest in displaying a lenient, forgiving spirit towards each other, than those who *must* live together; aye, and who must fight their way through the world in company? And yet how often do we find such a couple, whose unity is essential to their well being, begin their battle with the world with a battle between themselves! And all for what? Because one cannot overglance the petty infirmities of the other, but must rebuke and chide unavailingly, where a word of kindness would have been all-potent! With such silly-minded couples there would really be no keeping patience, were it not that the distressing circumstances of their folly prompt the attempt to infuse better dispositions within them. They may rely upon it, as upon a truth confirmed by ages of sad experience, that

> "Ruder words still rush in
> To swell the breach that words begin;"

and that, as poor Richard says, "a tongue without a curb, is worse than a horse without a bridle."

THE MORALS OF POLITICS.—The monstrous doctrine has gone abroad that if a man can keep up a character for honesty in his private business transactions, he may be as great a rogue as he pleases in political matters.

This code of morals, of which his Satanic majesty is the author, has spread through the country to an extent which is absolutely alarming. Governments which are founded upon false principles, and upheld by corruption may possible subsist under it; but for the American Republic a permanent existence under such a system is impossible. It strikes at the very root of our institutions, and unless a reformation can be effected our days as a nation are already numbered. Men must learn to be as honest in politics as in any thing else. In fact they will be as honest in one calling as in another, and no more so. A man will not be half a rogue. Let but a single corner of his heart become corrupt, and the withering influence will soon pervade his whole system. Let but one column of the temple of virtue in the human heart be broken, and the whole edifice will soon crumble to ruin. We would as soon trust to the honor of a thief, a swindler, or a highwayman, as to a politician who considers it proper to play the cheat for the purpose of carrying an election. A man can reason himself into one species of villiany as easily as another. And if he could do this under all circumstances, at any rate he would be ready for any crime when he could go so far as to cheat in politics in a country and under a government like ours; for in our view a more heinous crime cannot be found enrolled upon the black catalogue.—*Sun.*

GERMANY continues to be at peace. She merely declared during the late agitations in Europe, that she would defend herself firmly against France in case of a general war. To know the force of this declaration, it should be stated that the democratic journals of Paris pompously announce that the Germans were dissatisfied with their government, and that they would receive the French with open arms. This opinion is utterly false. The Germans have suffered too much by war from 1792 to 1814, to wish the return of the French across the Rhine. Far from inviting us, they would resist us with obstinacy and they would be right.—*Cor. N. Y. Obs.*

HOLLAND.—The king of Holland made solemn promises at his coronation. He has already introduced some excellent amendments in the governments. All the revenues of the country are at the disposal of the legislature, whereas before the king reserved to himself *alone* the right of disposing of the revenues of the colonies. The persecutions against dissenters are stopt. The prince means to allow all religious communions entire liberty of worship, and he ought to. Protestant governments dishonor the Reformation when they turn persecutors.—*Ib.*

A Case of Conscience.

A correspondent of the Catholic Register, of this city signing himself "Temperance" submitted the following case of conscience, and asked advice.

Mr. Editor,—I am a member of the Temperance Association formed in Transfiguration Church. I joined that society when I saw that it was approved of, and recommended by the clergy; not because I was addicted to intemperance myself, but I thought my example might influence others who were not as temperate as they ought to be, to take the pledge and become temperate. As I understood the pledge, according to the explanations given of it, to impose no obligations but what the Christian religion imposes on all the members of the Church, I did not feel myself obliged to make any change in my habits of life, in consequence of the pledge. I continue to take my glass of wine as usual at dinner, and on one or two occasions I have even ventured to take a glass of brandy and water, without entertaining the least suspicion that I was thereby violating the pledge I had taken. Nor do I now entertain any scruple on that head, for the pledge prohibits the use of intoxicating liquors "only to those who, by particular circumstance are in need of such restriction;" namely, those habitual drunkards, who cannot be cured of intemperance, except by total abstinence. Those who make *temperate* use of intoxicating drinks, neither violate the pledge nor commit sin, as I understand my Christian obligations,—and if I be in error I should like to be informed of it.

The generous editor takes his case into consideration, and proffers the following advice:

Remarks.—Our correspondent "Temperance" has not violated his pledge, or transgressed any law, human or divine, by the temperate use of intoxicating drinks, in which he has indulged. Were he a man of intemperate habits and so much addicted to liquor that he could not make a *temperate* use of it, then, in order to become temperate it would be necessary for him, in that case, to abstain totally from all intoxicating drinks; and accordingly, he would be bound to total abstinence by the rules of Christian morality, as well as by the pledge he has taken.

According to this a man may indulge in the use of intoxicating liquors until he becomes a man of intemperate habits and so much addicted to liquor that he "cannot make a temperate use of it," then he must totally abstain. How long would it take to reform Ireland by such means? Father Mathew would smile at such a pledge.
New-York Observer.

FORCED TO TAKE OFFICE.—The English papers give an instance of a man being forced to take office. Mr. Wm. Bright was called upon to take the office of ale taster. Mr. Bright hoped that the Recorder would not compel him to undertake the duties of the above office, as he was not partial to the taste of ale, or any strong drink. The Recorder said he considered that was not a sufficient objection. Mr. B. hoped the objection would be held good, as he was a tee-totaller. The Recorder said a gentleman's being a tee-totaller is not a sufficient disqualification for such an office; for all that he has to do, is to ascertain whether the ale sold is of such a quality as is fit for her majesty's subjects to drink. Mr. B. said he did not drink ale. The Recorder said the Jury could not appoint a fitter person—for his taste must be more perfect than those who indulged in ale. He was certain he would make a very excellent taster. And he was at last compelled to take the taster's oath.—So they had a man pledged not to drink, yet sworn to taste. So the two pledges would come together somewhere between the lips and the stomach.—*Puritan.*

CAUGHT IN HIS OWN TRAP.—The Portland Argus relates an amusing case, in which a beggar in that city received what he asked for, but not what he wished for.

"A few days ago, a full grown, able-bodied man, presented himself at the door of one of our citizens, and solicited the lady of the house to give him two cents. She remarked that she had none, and inquired what he wanted of them. "To buy a dose of castor oil, marm, (was the reply) for I am dreadful sick."

The lady had no cents, but she had plenty of oil; and she prepared him a stiff dose. He tried hard to get excused from taking it; but she was firm, he was a sick man, and it must go down. The loafer found he was caught in his own trap; and, where he meant to have a glass of liquor, he got a dose of physic; but, making a virtue of necessity, and with sundry wry faces, he gulped it down and cleared. He'd not call at that house again, we dare say.

THE TRULY GREAT MIND.—To the really great mind, the most serious obstacles are but stepping stones to facilitate its upward rising—the rounds in the ladder by which it ascends to an elevation at once beautiful and sublime. It feeds opposition, it courts danger, it smiles at the petty shafts of envy, and heeds not the hissings of the serpent, scandal. These it knows and *feels* are but temporary—Truth is immortal, and grounded on TRUTH, it will triumph over all obstacles that may be placed in its onward and upward career. And though it may not assume its true position here—is there not an hereafter? The truly great mind, then, is not over anxious for success in "the life that now is"—for if it have hope only in the present life, it is of all things the most miserable, but it looks to the future, and rests calmly secure in the bosom of the Infinite. All matter, all evil shall pass away, but the soul and the good shall live forever!—*Bay State Dem.*

GREAT BRITAIN AND FRANCE.—The hatred of France against Great Britain was publicly shown at the funeral of Napoleon. Many of the National Guards and of the laboring people cried out: *Down with the English! down with the treaties of* 1815! In other respects this funeral ceremony was grand and solemn. More than a million individuals were assembled in Paris. All the military and civil authorities wished to render a last homage to the illustrious captain who had so long led the French to victory. It was affecting to remark in the train the old soldiers of Napoleon, the remains of the brave combatants of Marengo, Austerlitz, Jena, and Wagram. They came around the coffin of their general, and they shed tears, when remembering their former victories.—*Cor. N. Y. Obs.*

PRUSSIA.—The coronation of the King of Prussia was remarkable for the pious sentiments uttered by this prince. He solemnly invoked God before his people; he promised to govern in the fear of God, upon Christian principles. "I recognize before you all," said he, "that I hold my crown in trust from the Lord, and that I must account to him for every day and every hour of my reign. This is the security I offer you for the future; nor can I nor any body else give a better security; it has more authority, more binding force than all the oaths of a coronation, than all pledges written upon parchments or upon brass; for it comes from the heart, and it has its foundation in faith."—*Ib.*

DAGUERREOTYPE PORTRAITS.—We have seen several photographic portraits recently taken in a new and beautiful style by Professor Morse, at the rooms fitted up for the purpose in the building on the corner of Nassau and Beekman streets. By a proper distribution of drapery and other contrivances, Professor M. gives his portraits all the effect of fine pictures. A variety of specimens may be seen by the curious at the Professor's rooms. Some of them present family groups, embracing four or five individuals.

ARISTOCRACY OF RELIGION.—We condemn aristocracy in politics—and in social matters even—as unsuitable to the genius of our republican institutions; and in this we do well. God made all men equally free and independent, and any thing which would raise up distinctions not founded in merit, is hostile to the government under which we live. But whilst all agree to condemn aristocracy in politics, there does not seem to be an equal aversion to aristocracy in religion.—With most minds the question is, not *what is truth*, but what is the most fashionable society to worship with? We verily fear that the motive of attachment to many churches is to secure the praise of men, rather than the praise of God.—And wherever pride and fashion are held out as the main inducement for people to connect themselves with any religious society, we regard it as a dead certainty that the simplicity of the gospel and the power of religion are not *there*. They cannot inhabit the same house together—it is impossible they should. Men cannot serve God and mammon. Pride and humility cannot mix together.—*Gospel Banner.*

TRAVELLING EIGHTY YEARS AGO.—On the 30th of April, 1761, Mr. John Stavers, then host of the Pitt Tavern, in Pitt-street (now Court-street,) commenced running a stage from this town to Boston. The carriage was a curricle, drawn by two horses, sufficiently wide to carry three passengers. It left this town on Monday morning, and proceeded as far as Ipswitch the same day, and reached Charlestown Ferry the next day. It left Charlestown on Thursday and arrived here on Friday. The fare from this place to Boston was was thirteen shillings and sixpence sterling—equal to three dollars. It is supposed that this was the first stage which was ever run in America.

Little did our ancestors then think, while dragging their slow length along, that their journey of two days would, in another generation, be reduced to about a couple of hours. Yet such is the fruition of living.—*Portsmouth N. H. Gaz.*

NEW SYSTEM OF TELEGRAPH.—It is stated in the Baltimore Sun, that Mons. Gonon, the inventor of a new system of telegraphs, is now treating with the government to establish a line of telegraphs in this country. The Sun adds that Gonon's system is perfect; a despatch of any length can be transmitted with accuracy and celerity.—In case we should be involved in a war, such a system would be beneficial, as the head of the government could be informed of the passing events through the whole Union, and shape its measures accordingly.

The mind of a thinking man resembles the soil beneath whose surface lie many precious seeds. Every rain calls forth buds, and every beam of the sun produces flowers. Fruits fail not in their due time. The flower garden of a mind merely learned, endures but during the night. The flowers wither away under the rays of the sun, and are followed by no fruits.

SECOND APPEAL TO THE PUBLIC ON BEHALF OF THE AFRICANS TAKEN IN THE AMISTAD.

The time has now arrived when new and heavy expenses are to be incurred for the protection and deliverance of the thirty-six surviving Africans who are still in the custody of our government, awaiting the final decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Several hundreds of dollars are still due for the expenses of instructing them daily for upward of fifteen months, and eminent counsel will be engaged as soon as the means are furnished, to conduct their defence, at Washington City, next January. If any one doubts the extremity of the peril in which these Africans are placed, let him read the Congressional document containing the correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Spanish Minister.

Shall these hapless sons of Africa, for want of farther aid, and able professional defenders, be surrendered to the Spanish Minister, who claims them "not as slaves but as assassins?" Will not the generous men and women who have already contributed to afford instruction and legal protection to these interesting strangers, again open their hands for their relief—and will not those who have not yet contributed for these noble purposes, forward their donations, which are needed more than ever at this juncture? Donors can designate in what way their benefactions shall be appropriated—whether for education or general purposes. Such sums as may be contributed for the former purpose will be handed to the committee at New Haven, Rev. L. Bacon, Rev. H. G. Ludlow, and Amos Townsend, Jr. Esq., and other donations will be appropriated by the undersigned according to their best judgment. All donations will be acknowledged in the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter, and a copy sent to each donor. The disbursements will also be published. Money can be sent to Samuel D. Hastings, Esq., No. 20 Commerce street, Philadelphia; to Rev. A. A. Phelps, No 36 Washington street, Ellis Gray Loring, Boston; or to Lewis Tappan, 122 Pearl street, and 131 Nassau street, New-York.

S. S. JOCELYN,
JOSHUA LEAVITT, } *Committee.*
LEWIS TAPPAN,

SINGING SCHOOLS.

MR. WM. C. WEBSTER would respectfully announce, that he will open a School for the study and practice of SACRED MUSIC, in the Hall corner of Broadway and Houston st., (entrance to which is No. 603 Broadway,) on THURSDAY EVENING, the 19th instant, at 7 o'clock.

A Juvenile Singing School, for children of both sexes, from 6 to 15 years of age, will be commenced on SATURDAY AFTERNOON, the 21st inst., at half past three o'clock, at the same place. The Pestalozzian system is made the basis of instruction in these schools.

Terms to the above schools—the adult, for gentlemen, $3; for ladies, $2 per course of 18 lessons. The Juvenile School, $2 per scholar for 24 lessons.

Tickets of admission to the above schools may be obtained at the Book stores of Goold, Newman & Saxton, corner of Nassau and Fulton streets, John P. Haven, Broadway, and of Mr. W. at his Hall, on the evenings and afternoons of school.

Refer to Rev. J. O. CHOULES, 502 Broome st.
Rev. LA ROY SUNDERLAND, Editor of [the Watchman.
L. EAMES, Esq., 88 Hicks st. Brooklyn, N.Y
N. SOUTHARD, Editor Youth's Cabinet.
G H. ANDREWS, Courier & Enq. Office.

A Rich New Year's Present.

YOUTH'S CABINET.

For Families and Sunday Schools, weekly, at $1 per year, in advance.

THE Fourth Volume of this well known and highly approved Juvenile paper commences the first week in January, 1841, edited by N. Southard. It is made up of choice Narratives, original and select, pleasing Moral and Religious, Literary and Scientific Instruction, a variety of Useful Information, Juvenile Poetry, Anecdotes, &c., all designed to promote the best good of the young. It inculcates impartial Benevolence, Temperance, and all other Christian Virtues.

It is neatly printed on half a royal sheet, and each number contains one or more engravings. It has been highly recommended by one hundred editors and many parents and teachers, in notices and letters like the following.

From a Mother in Springfield, Mass

"My little girl is delighted with the Cabinet. She can scarcely wait for the week to come round, and when the little welcome messenger arrives, her work or play is laid aside, to have a feast, as she calls it, with the welcome guest. She is willing to make any sacrifice rather than give up her paper."

From a Clergyman in Central New-York

"My little daughter 8 years old, is very much delighted with your paper, and indeed, I read it myself with great interest."

We would refer those who wish for a neat, appropriate paper for their children, to the Youth's Cabinet, which they will find all they could desire in such a publication. *Green Mountain Emporium.*

We hope all the young who can afford it, will have the opportunity of reading the Youth's Cabinet. *N H Bap Register.*

We must say, that it is decidedly the most interesting youth's paper we have seen. *N. Y. Weekly Messenger.*

Mr. Southard, its editor, has a happy faculty to convey instruction in an interesting manner so as to leave a strong impression upon the minds of his juvenile readers. Its moral influence is decidedly good. If any family of children should unite and send one dollar, post paid, they will never be sorry that they had paid out their money for so good a paper.—*Oberlin Evangelist.*

Orders should be addressed, (post paid,) to the editor at No 9, Spruce street, New-York, or 25 Cornhill, Boston
Dec. 10, 1840. 6w

FRIENDS' INTELLIGENCER,

For sale by Isaac T. Hopper, 143 Nassau Street.

THE FRIENDS' INTELLIGENCER, &c., containing 769 pages large octavo—price $1 50. It contains much interesting original and selected matter, well worth the attention of the members of the Society of Friends, as well as the public generally.

Bound up in the volume will be found, "Brief Remarks on some of the charges recently made against the early writers of the Society of Friends, by George Harrison, New Castle, England." The following short extract will shew, in some measure, the character of the work, viz:

"The working of this subtil spirit, which has got abroad,—this old accuser of the brethren, has been very insidious; it has been at work for many years, but durst not avow its real object and character. It pretended it was attacking Hicksism, but it was easy to see, long ago, that genuine Quakerism was meant. It is now throwing off the mask, and shewing itself in its true colors."

"THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM, an absolute and irresistible proof of the Divine origin of Christianity; including a Narrative of the calamities which befel the Jews, so far as they tend to verify our Lord's predictions relative to that event: with a description of the City and Temple." This work is deeply interesting to Christians of all denominations

"The history of the life of Thomas Ellwood, or an account of his birth, education, &c, with divers observations on his life and manners when a youth; and how he came to be convinced of the truth; with his many sufferings and services for the same. Also, several other remarkable passages and occurrences. Written by his own hand. To which is added, a supplement," by J. W.

It can hardly be necessary to inform any member of the Society of Friends of the merits of this work. It has gone through four editions, and is among the most interesting of Friends' journals.

This latter work can be had separately—price 50 cents

Right and Wrong in the Anti-Slavery Societies.

> ——by the soul
> Only, the nations shall be great and free!
> WORDSWORTH.

THE Seventh Annual Report of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society, presented October 14, 1840. For sale at the anti-slavery office, 143 Nassau st. Price, 12½ cents single.

This work ought to be in the hands of every abolitionist.

The following selection from it is the purest gold, and beautifully wrought out.

"The anti-slavery societies have not yet done their work. When, in the heat of political excitement, amid which the favorers of the cause, a few years hence, will be engaged; when, in the conflict of a northern and southern party, yet to spring out of this question, *compensation—partial emancipation—intermediate arrangements—delay*, become the rallying words of the opposition—then let the slave rejoice if the anti-slavery societies exist, to urge up to the mark a partially regenerated people, who, though *favorers* of the cause of freedom, will not deserve to be called its friends; for they will need constant and persevering rebuke, entreaty, warning, to prevent their making shipwreck of the cause. Not by numbers, but by laborious and energetic fidelity, will the work be wrought out. 'Not by might nor by power but by *my Spirit*, saith the Lord of hosts.'"

Nov. 19, 1840

Just Published,

"The Envoy, From Free hearts to the Free."

A COLLECTION of original pieces in poetry and prose, published by the Pawtucket Juvenile Emancipation Society, for the benefit of its funds.

This little volume is confidently recommended to the patronage of the public, as it is believed that it will be found to possess merit independent of the object which has called it forth. Many writers have contributed to the pages of the annual, presenting thereby a pleasing variety in style and sentiment; yet agreeing in these grand and fundamental points, the universal brotherhood of *man*, and the abolition of *all* slavery.

For sale at 143 Nassau street—25 Cornhill, Boston—the Anti-Slavery Office, Providence, and at J M'Intyre's, Pawtucket, R. I. Price 42 cts

New York, November 19, 1840.

Free Dry Goods.

CALICOES, bleached and unbleached muslins, bleached and unbleached Cotton flannel, apron check, colored muslins, printed and plain pongees, bleached, unbleached mixed, and lead-colored knitting cotton, cotton and linen table diapers, printed and plain grass cloths, wicking and cotton laps, fine linen thread, superfine bed ticking, cotton pantaloon stuffs, men's and women's cotton hose, white and black wadding. Also, a variety of silk, linen, and woollen goods, wholesale and retail.

CHARLES WISE,
Corner of Arch & Fifth street,

Philadelphia, 11th mo. 12, 1840.

N. B. Persons from a distance wishing any of the above goods can have them sent, by forwarding their orders to the subscriber. C WISE.

Dr. Church's Tooth Powder,

OR THE GREAT TOOTH PRESERVATIVE.

1. It is excellent in cleansing the Teeth and makin them white, and preventing their decay. In order to kee the teeth clean and wholesome, the Brush and Powder mus be used; for, by the frequent mastication of food, there is viscid matter which adheres to the teeth, and which, if no removed, causes disease and decay.

2. It is an infallible cure for the Tartar collected on th Teeth, wholly removing it. Now, whenever tartar is su fered to gather, it occasions the swelling and inflaming the gums, causing absorption and the expulsion of the tee from the jaws, while it is the source of great pain.

3. It is sure to cause and preserve a sweet breath, an a pleasant taste to the mouth. Sad indeed is the evil, th pain, the destruction of comfort and health, which is brough about by *neglect*. For there is and there can be nothin worse for an individual than a bad breath; yet by overloo ing the teeth, how many hundreds and thousands have a di agreeable breath; and when in conversation, even, are co scious of it, and involuntarily turn their heads!—Still, all th can be remedied in a short time, by the application of th powder, so that health, comfort and beauty, and a swe breath will be in the possession of all

4. It hardens the gums. When the gums are soft an spongy, this powder will make them hard. Nearly one-h of the teeth which are lost, is owing to the disease of th soft and spongy gums, and collection of tartar.

For sale by Gould, Newman & Saxton, corner of Fult and Nassau streets.

ANTI-SLAVERY ALMANAC FOR 1841.

This Almanac is filled with a great amount of origi and interesting matter, from the pen of Theodore D. Wel It is not only calculated to awaken a new and lively intere among Freedom's warmest friends, but admirably adapt to make new converts to the anti-slavery cause, as most the popular objections to immediate and unconditio emancipation are considered in the author's clear, logic and caustic style. Let there be no delay in procuring copy; and when it is purchased, don't throw it aside, to osed only to ascertain the time of the sun's rising and s ting, but at once read it through attentively. When y have done this, you will feel like co-operating with a f friends to put a copy into every family in your respecti towns.—*Liberator.*

☞ Price $30 per 1000. 6 cents single. To be had all the Depositories.

INFORMATION WANTED.—Of EDWARD POWELL, CATHARINE CRUMWELL, his sister, formerly of Flatbu L. I., subsequently of Brooklyn and of this city. Any p son knowing either of the above named persons, or t children, will confer a favor by leaving word at this off or at 61 Cherry street, upon A RELATIV

Local Agents for the Standard.

EDWARD M. DAVIS, Philadelphia, Penn.
JAMES M McKIM, " "
WILLIAM APLIN, Providence, R. I.
LORRIN WHITING, New Marlborough, Mass.
LUTHER MYRICK, Cazenovia, N. Y.
W C BLOSS, Rochester, N. Y.
JAMES COOPER, Williamson, Wayne Co., N. Y.
PLINY SEXTON, Palmyra, Wayne Co., N. Y.
J. C. HATHAWAY, Farmington, Ontario Co, N. Y.
WM T CRITTENDEN, Rushville, Ontario Co., N
WM. P POWELL, No. 61 Cherry st, New-York
THOMAS McCLINTOCK, Waterloo, N. Y.
MORRIS EARLE, Penn Yan, Yates Co, N. Y
ROBERT H FOLGER, Massillon, Ohio.
BENJAMIN BOWEN, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
NATHAN W. WHITMORE, Dixon's Ferry, Lee Co.,
SLOCOMB HOWLAND, Sherwood Corners, Cayuga Co
PRINCE JACKSON, Syracuse, Onondaga Co, N. Y.
JAMES HECOK, Cato Four Corners, Cayuga Co., N
THOS HUTCHINSON, Kings Ferry, Cayuga Co.
CALEB B ROGERS, Norwich, Conn
WM C NELL, 25 Cornhill, Boston, Mass.
JOHN C MERRITT, Bethpage, L. I

Travelling Agents.

WM O DUVALL, Port Byron, N. Y.
LORENZO HATHAWAY, Farmington, Ontario Co., N
M. M PORTER, Oswego, N. Y.
CYRIL COLL, Egypt, Monroe Co, N. Y.
CHARLES STEARNS, P. O., Greenfield, Mass]
E D HUDSON, P. O., Hartford, Conn.
JARED S. BRAINARD, P. O, Killingly, Conn.
ABEL TANNER, P O., Providence, R. I.
LEWIS PITTS, Danby, Tompkins co. N.Y